MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JULY, 1937

VOLUME 19 NEW SERIES, VOLUME 8 NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

AN APPRAISAL OF SHELBURNE'S WESTERN POLICY . . . . . *Charles Metzger* 169

OSAGE MISSION, A FACTOR IN THE MAKING OF KANSAS . . . . . *Sister Mary Paul Fitzgerald* 182

LA SALLE, 1669-1673 . . . . . *Jean Delanglez* 197

NOTES AND COMMENT 217

BOOK REVIEWS 224

PIERCE, *A History of Chicago: Vol. I, The Beginning of a City, 1673-1848;* CURTIS, *A History of Ireland;* PIERRE-GEORGES ROY, *Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Quebec pour 1935-1936;* BURNS AND KOHLBRENNER, *A History of Catholic Education in the United States;* HICKS, *The Federal Union;* EPSTEIN, *Decet Meminisse Fratrum. A Necrology of Chicago Diocesan Priests, 1844-1937;* WARNER, *Archbishop Lamy, An Epoch Maker;* PALM, *The Middle Classes Then and Now;* GERSTENBERG, *American Constitutional Law;* BROMAGE, *State Government and Administration in the United States.*

CONTRIBUTORS 234

MANAGING EDITOR
JEROME V. JACOBSEN, *Chicago*

EDITORIAL STAFF

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN
WILLIAM STETSON MERRILL
PAUL J. FOIK
W. EUGENE SHIELS
RAPHAEL HAMILTON
RAYMOND CORRIGAN
PAUL KINIERY
JEAN DELANGLEZ

Published quarterly by Loyola University (The Institute of Jesuit History) at 50 cents a copy. Annual subscription, $2.00; in foreign countries, $2.50. Publication and editorial offices at Loyola University, 6525 Sheridan Road, Chicago, Illinois. All communications should be addressed to the Managing Editor. Entered as second class matter August 7, 1929, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879. Printed in the United States. Copyright, 1937, by Loyola University.

Printed by
LOYOLA UNIVERSITY PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

MID-AMERICA

An Historical Review

JULY, 1937

VOLUME 19 NEW SERIES, VOLUME 8 NUMBER 3

An Appraisal of Shelburne's Western Policy

William Petty, Earl of Shelburne, first Marquis of Lansdowne, "exercised greater influence on the development of western America than any other British statesman, not excepting William Pitt."[1] To dissent from this judgment of Dr. Clarence Alvord would be rash. On three occasions Shelburne influenced the West: in 1763 when he was president of the Lords of Trade; in 1766 when he was secretary of state for the southern department; in 1783 when he was prime minister. Our interest centers on the second period of influence, with some attention, however, to the first period when his policies began to take shape. Any appraisal of Shelburne's western policy of necessity involves some account of its genesis and development, as well as a comparison with rival policies.

The war between England and France for supremacy on the continent of North America was ended by the terms of capitulation "done in camp before Montreal, 8 September, 1760." Of the fifty-five articles agreed to by Major General Jeffrey Amherst and the Marquis de Vaudreuil,[2] representatives respectively of victors and vanquished, three bear directly on the subject of this study. Article 39 stipulates that "none of the Canadians, Acadians or French, who are now in Canada, or on the frontiers of the colony, on the side of Acadia, Detroit, Michillimaquinac, and other places and posts of the country above, the married and unmarried soldiers, remaining in Canada, shall be carried or transported into the British colonies, or to Great Britain"; ar-

EDITOR'S NOTE. This paper was read at the annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Society in St. Louis, Missouri, April 29, 1937.

[1] Clarence W. Alvord, *The Mississippi Valley in British Politics*, Cleveland, 1917, I, 140.

[2] Adam Shortt and Arthur G. Doughty, *Documents relating to Constitutional History of Canada. 1759-1791*, Part I, 25-26.

ticle 40 states that "the Savages or Indian allies of his most Christian Majesty, shall be maintained in the Lands they inhabit"; article 46 declares that "the inhabitants and Merchants shall enjoy the same favours and conditions granted to the subjects of his Britannic Majesty, as well as in the countries above, as in the interior of the colony."

For three years during which peace negotiations dragged on in Paris little was done to implement these articles. Eventually article VII of the definitive treaty of peace, signed in Paris, February 10, 1763, established the Mississippi River as the boundary between British and French territory, and declared for mutual, unmolested navigation of the said river.[8] Thus England secured undisputed claim to the territory that lay to the west of her older seaboard colonies, and thus too was the problem of the west, sketched in faintest outline, dropped into Britannia's lap. The future of 'England in America' was to hinge on her method and manner of solution.

In a sense, then, the problem of the West originated with the capitulation of the French at Montreal on September 8, 1760, and the peace of Paris on February 10, 1763; in another sense, however, it came into being independently of treaties. By and large it may be regarded as a phase of the general imperial problem created by expansion and conquest. A broad and definite government policy was imperative, but such a policy was beset with difficulty, if it was not quite impossible. For British politics had touched the very nadir; ministries were short-lived; statesmen gave place to politicians, who, as Chesterfield remarked, were preoccupied with the need "to find pasture enough for the beasts that they must feed." The very topography of the country was largely unknown, and the value of the territory little appreciated. The problem itself was many-sided, for it was compounded of many elements—white men and Indians, foreigners and subjects of the king, colonial rights and claims, the hopes of speculators, imperial finances and defense, colonization, forms of government, the apprehension of criminals, trade and manufactures—elements that ramified into bewildering complexity. Finally, Amherst's attempt at an army solution of the Indian aspects of the problem had precipitated Pontiac's far-flung uprising, which in turn raised new issues.

From May to August 1763 Egremont and Shelburne were in

[8] *Ibid.*, Part I, 113-126.

communication. This interchange of letters[4] between the secretary of state and the president of the Lords of Trade enables us to gauge Shelburne's early understanding of the issues involved, and to outline the solution he advocated. In substance he held out for the establishment of regular civil government while he admitted that prevailing conditions made military control a necessity for some time to come. Eventual settlement he regarded as necessary to insure monopoly of the Indian trade, the development of a market for British goods, and the exclusion of criminals or fugitives from justice; but as yet he was not specific as to where the settlements should be made. For the present the territory should be organized as an independent unit; it should not be attached to one of the old colonies, still less should it be made an appendage of Canada. For the time being Indian hunting grounds should be inviolate, all granting of land and settlement being forbidden; and trade should be under the supervision of the military but open to all. In these provisions and general principles we have the nucleus of Shelburne's ultimate western policy.

At this juncture the death of Egremont and the vicissitudes of British politics removed Shelburne from active participation in the work of defining government policy. For while Halifax, Egremont's successor, was not opposed to Shelburne's opinions, Hillsborough, who succeeded Shelburne in September, upon the latter's resignation, entertained divergent views. For some time, however, Shelburne's influence continued to be felt. Thus on September 19 Halifax apprised the newly constituted Lords of Trade that the king was pleased to dissociate the territory from the other colonies and from Canada;[5] likewise that he approved of temporary restriction on settlement to appease the Indians, and the preservation of law and order by the commandants of the various posts and forts. Even Hillsborough followed the path traced by Shelburne in as much as the Proclamation of 1763, drafted by Shelburne before his resignation, incorporated in large measure the ideas of the former president of the Board. By degrees Shelburne's influence waned, and government circles appear to have lost interest in the knotty problem. At any rate nothing of moment was accomplished till 1766.

---

[4] *Ibid.*, 127, Egremont to the Lords of Trade, May 5, 1763; 131-147, Lords of Trade to Egremont, June 8, 1763; 147-150, Egremont to Lords of Trade, July 14, 1763; 150-153, Lords of Trade to Egremont, August 5, 1763.

[5] *Ibid.*, 153-155, Halifax to Lords of Trade, September 19, 1763.

Why so little progress was made in the two years after Shelburne's withdrawal may be gathered from a letter of George Croghan to William Johnson. Writing March 10, 1764 from London, whither he had gone on personal business as well as in the interests of Indian traders and as the mouthpiece of Johnson, this intrepid explorer, trader and agent, betrays such a naïve originality in orthography as to evoke admiration for his genius. "Tho I have been hear Now a Month," he writes,

"Nothing has been don Respecting North aMerrica—the pople hear Spend thire Time in Nothing butt abuseing one aNother & Striveing who Shall be in power with a view to Serve themselves & thire frends, and Neglect the publick itt was butt yesterday that your State of Indian affairs was Read att the Board of Trade tho I Deliverd itt the 13th of Last Month Lord Halifax & Lord Hillsborrow boath have Read itt and Mr penn tould me yesterday that Lord hallifax approves Much of Every thing you have Recommended, Lord Hallifax Talkt with Me about a boundrey with the Indians and I Menshond to him your Honours thoughts on itt, . . . there is a Talk of Setleing a Colony from the Mouth of the ohio to the Ilonies which I am Tould Lord Hallifax will Desier My opinion of in a fwe Days— . . . what Meshurs they will Take the Lord knows butt Nothing is Talkt of Except oconemy I hope in About Ten Days to be able to acquaint you of the Meshurs which will be Taken for the futer in Indian affairs. . . ."[6]

How familiar the setting: men, intent on the game of politics, shouting such catchwords as economy!

Despite official apathy Croghan and Johnson continued to press the matter with the Lords of Trade.[7] They urged the establishment of a colony in Illinois as an outlet for British goods, a means of engrossing the fur trade, of thwarting the machination of the French and Spanish among the Indians. And since economy had become the touchstone of English politicians, as well as of Gage, the commander-in-chief in America, Croghan and Johnson advocated settlement on the very score of economy. At this time, too, Benjamin Franklin became convinced of the feasibility of a colony in the Illinois country.[8]

If the wheels of government revolve slowly they nevertheless turn. And so by May 10, 1766, Viscount Barrington,[9] an incom-

---

[6] *Illinois Historical Collections, The Critical Period,* X, 221-224.

[7] *Ibid.,* 256-263, Croghan to the Lords of Trade, June 8, 1764; *Ill. Hist. Col., The New Régime,* XI, 149-153, Johnson to the Lords of Trade, January 31, 1766, 193-196, Johnson to the Lords of Trade, March 22, 1766.

[8] Benjamin Franklin, *Works,* ed. by J. Bigelow, New York, 1887, IV, 416.

[9] Barrington was secretary at war from July 1765 to December 1778, largely because he was a favorite of George III. Conscious of his limitations he had the good sense to perceive the incongruity of his filling some of the offices to which he was appointed.

petent placeman of the easily adjustable type, trained in the school of Newcastle, now secretary at war under Rockingham, was ready with his answer to the problem.[10] Since his suggestions were never acted upon, their interest is largely academic; nevertheless they are of value because they mirror the mind of a section of British political life and serve as a contrast to Shelburne's views. Barrington insisted that his opinion was the result of discussion with well-informed men in England, supplemented by information from Gage, Robertson, and William Johnson. Ignoring the qualifying phrase "for the present" in the Proclamation of 1763[11] he asserted that the western country was "intended to be a Desert for the Indians to hunt in and inhabit." On this assumption he opposed the continuance of forts already in existence and the establishment of new ones in that region. Such forts were expensive and ineffective; they were not needed and they endangered army discipline and esprit de corps. In flat contradiction to the testimony of Croghan[12] and Gage[13] and others on the spot he alleged that the Indian trade was even now virtually the monopoly of the British, and must continue to be theirs, forts or no forts. By inference settlements and civil government were ruled out. In short, Barrington, seeing eye to eye with the Old Whigs, was for stopping all settlement at the Appalachian Mountains because there was enough unoccupied land east of the mountains to last "for ages." In other words he tried to solve the problem by denying its existence and by attempting to preclude the possibility of its rising in the future. In this way expenses would be cut and military discipline would be preserved.

In July 1766 another shuffle of the political cards made Pitt prime minister with Shelburne secretary of state for the southern department in succession to Conway, and Hillsborough president of the Board of Trade. Since Shelburne's views on the problem of the west were no secret[14] various individuals and interests pressed the project of a settlement in Illinois,[15] a proposi-

[10] Lansdowne Mss., William Clements Library, Ann Arbor, 50:45.

[11] Shortt and Doughty, *Documents*, 163-168.

[12] *Ill. Hist. Col.*, X, 256-263, Croghan to the Lords of Trade, June 8, 1764.

[13] *Ibid.*, XI, 339-341, Gage to Conway, July 15, 1766.

[14] Benjamin Franklin, *Writings*, ed. by Albert H. Smyth, New York and London, 1905-1907, IV, 461.

[15] *Ill. Hist. Col.*, XI, 366-368, Baynton, Wharton and Morgan to Johnson, August 28, 1766; Franklin, *Works*, IV, 417, B. Franklin to W. Franklin, September 12, 1766; *Writings*, IV, 461, B. Franklin to Johnson, September 12, 1766.

tion "well listened to" in London, as Franklin testified. While the secretary of state would not be stampeded into action his mind was open to the extent that he sought information from every likely quarter, taking care meanwhile not to be unduly impressed by the bias of his informants.[16] If during one interview he raised objections to the idea urged by Franklin, even going so far as to assert that the latter's arguments "did not appear of much weight,"[17] on another occasion he told Franklin that while he "really approved" the plan, he hesitated because every new expense proposed for America alarmed the Treasury.[18] In turn Lyman's prolix and disorderly arguments[19] and Richard Jackson's devastating critique[20] of Barrington's plan reached Shelburne's desk. From this welter of documents and correspondence he concluded by December 1766 that the pressing issues were Indian control and trade, the disposal of the troops and reduction of costs.[21] Government must await adoption of a general plan for America. Meanwhile, much to the alarm of Croghan,[22] Gage began to waver[23] in his advocacy of settlements, but he still saw the connection between settlements and trade, and the possibility of settlements provisioning the forts.[24]

Yes trade! It was the fear of losing this lucrative trade that caused Shelburne to dissent from Townshend's opinion,[25] for the alternative was loss of trade or the development of new posts suggested by Gage as indispensable to the retention and expansion of Britain's share in trade. "I think there can be no hesitation," he writes in March 1767, "in regard to the propriety of incurring the consequent Expense" if we bear in mind the effects of strategic forts and posts. Besides a fund for American expenses might be reasonably expected in time. "A plan calculated

---

[16] Franklin, *Works,* IV, 420, B. Franklin to W. Franklin, November 8, 1766.

[17] *Ibid.,* IV, 418, B. Franklin to W. Franklin, September 27, 1766.

[18] *Ibid.,* IV, 419, B. Franklin to W. Franklin, October 11, 1766.

[19] *Ill. Hist. Col.,* XI, 265-289, "Lyman's Reasons for a Settlement on the Mississippi, 1766."

[20] Lansdowne Mss., 57:84, 50:77, Jackson's Opinions on Western Plans, November, 1766. Richard Jackson was highly regarded for his knowledge of American affairs. Upon leaving the Grenville faction in 1763 he attached himself to Shelburne, who frequently had recourse to him for information.

[21] Lansdowne Mss., 57-draft, Shelburne to Gage, December 11, 1766.

[22] *Ibid.,* 50:281, Croghan to B. Franklin, January 27, 1767.

[23] *Ibid.,* 49:636, Gage to Shelburne, February 22, 1767.

[24] *Ibid.,* 85:102, "Reasons for not diminishing American Expense this year," March 30, 1767; cf. also *Ill. Hist. Col.,* XI, 552-555, Gage to Shelburne, April 4, 1767.

[25] *Ibid.*

upon Solid Principles for the Distribution of Expense, & at the same time for the Security of Government & the Extension of Commerce, whenever it appears, must command assent. If no Person has such a Plan yet in readiness, a time must be granted to those who are willing to produce it." And, pending the reports of all the governors and the commander-in-chief and the Indian superintendents written to on the subject, Shelburne himself was willing, despite an unsympathetic Board of Trade.[26]

Such was Shelburne's industry that by September 11, 1767 he was prepared to submit to the cabinet a memorandum for consideration,[27] and on October 5 he presented a series of suggestions to the Board of Trade.[28] Taken together these documents present his final solution of the problem of the west. The earlier document lays insistence on the pressing need for decision because Indian superintendents and officials disclaim further responsibility for what may happen unless conditions are changed, while merchants at home and abroad complain of losses sustained because of indefiniteness of policy. Such inaction in the councils of government must be ascribed to the disturbed state of the colonies for the previous two or three years. In addition to the inconveniences rising from the prevailing lack of system, current expenses force action. With the repeal of the Stamp Act the British taxpayer was promised a plan that would lighten his burden, but no plan proposed thus far has had an eye to economy as well as the abolition of the abuses which form the basis of complaint of officials and business men. Barrington's plan is dictated too largely by military considerations. The Proclamation of 1763 cannot be enforced. New colonies, argued Shelburne, imply migration from the old, and this in turn implies a high price for labor with a consequent check to manufacturing in the old colonies. The alternative is fixed boundaries, increase in population, manufacturing, self-subsistence, loss of dependence, independence. On these grounds Amherst, Gage and Johnson unite in recommending the establishment of new governments, a project answering every intention of the British government, and economical as well, for posts at Detroit and in Illinois would provision garrisons, secure the whole interior region, eventually provide a fund for defraying expenses, make possible the discontinuance of other posts now maintained, and remove the causes

---

[26] Lansdowne Mss., 85:102.
[27] *Ibid.*, 50:185.
[28] *Ibid.*, 50:173.

of Indian resentment. If in objection to this scheme it be urged that the Indians would offer opposition the answer is that settlements already exist at Detroit and in Illinois, and that the Indians would not resent the purchase of any additional land that might be deemed necessary; if it be urged further that settlements so remote would turn to manufacturing it can be said that these words betray ignorance of the country where water communication is easy.

Much the same as the foregoing was the second document, the memorandum to the Lords of Trade of October 5, but in this case Shelburne stressed financial considerations and the saving to be effected by his policy even if it included new settlements. The present system of managing the Indians, he insisted, and the whole military setup was excessively costly. To what extent, he asked, could expenses be reduced consistently with safety and propriety? For example, could superintendents be dispensed with? Could trade be turned over to the colonies, and if so under what restrictions? Which forts were actually needed, which no longer of use? At the same time Shelburne submitted letters from Amherst and Gage advocating settlements on the Mississippi, Ohio, and Illinois where a considerable body of French lived under no form of civil government, and he asked the Lords to weigh the arguments he advanced for securing the fur trade against the French and Spaniards, for checking their intrigues among the Indians, and promoting expansion with a view to creating a market for British manufactures and supplying garrisons. Then he requested serious consideration of the contention that new settlements would protect the old, would render inner fortifications unnecessary, cut down expenses and keep the Indians in awe. He concluded with the request that their Lordships ponder "in what Manner your Lordships think these Points can be regulated so as most effectually to promote the Prosperity & Happiness of the several Provinces, as well as the real & solid advantage to the Mother Country, objects which His Majesty has so much at heart."

In what respects, it may be asked, do Shelburne's views at this time represent an advance over those of the summer of 1763? In the first place he believed that the time had come for replacing military government by civil government. Moreover he had grown more confirmed in his belief that new settlements were useful, even essential; he thought, too, that they should be made without delay, and, in a general way, he had fixed upon

sites, chosen because of their strategic value. There was no change of opinion in regard to the desirability of keeping the west distinct from Canada and the seaboard colonies. Finally, whereas formerly he had advocated military supervision of trade he now thought it best to leave to the Lords of Trade the decision as to how traffic with the natives should be carried on.

How would the Lords of Trade, headed by Hillsborough, respond? Would endorsement, modification or rejection be their decision? Promptly on October 6 they called on the secretary to hand over all papers in his office relative to the several points of his plan.[29] By October 13, this subpoena being complied with, they began their deliberations.[30] Their Journal records "further progress" on October 14[31] and 21, on which day they decided to summon the principal merchants interested in the North American trade.[32] When these men assembled on October 27 and learned what was expected of them they asked leave to consult together.[33] In their conclusions, dated October 30, they advocated entrusting the Indian trade to the several colonies, and then lined up solidly in support of Shelburne's arguments for new settlements.[34]

Confronted with the merchants' endorsement of Shelburne's plan the Lords set to work again, but caution marked their proceedings. On November 17 they appealed to Amherst and General Monckton for further information;[35] on November 19 they questioned some officers in the North American military service; on the following day[36] they studied Gage's letter to Shelburne of October 10, as well as other papers sent by Shelburne. Still there was no decision. And there is the tragedy, for early in January 1768 there was another shakeup in government circles, and Shelburne found his department modified by the creation of a secretaryship of state for colonies, an office entrusted to Hillsborough who regarded Shelburne's plan as "radical, hasty and dangerous."[37] Thus in the words of Franklin, Shelburne was

---

[29] *Ill. Hist. Col. XVI, Trade and Politics*, 82 (Board of Trade Journal, October 6, 1767).
[30] *Ibid.*, 87, Journal, October 13, 1767.
[31] *Ibid.*, 88, October 14, 1767.
[32] *Ibid.*, 91, October 21, 1767.
[33] *Ibid.*, 101, October 27, 1767.
[34] Lansdowne Mss., 62:205.
[35] Journal, 107, November 17, 1767.
[36] *Ibid.*, 108, November 19, 1767.
[37] Alvord, *The Mississippi Valley*, II, 25.

again "stripped of the American business."[38] The death knell of Shelburne's high hopes was sounded. Franklin pinned his own dying hopes on the possibility of further changes in an unstable administration.

With Shelburne at a distance Hillsborough would have his way; his overemphasis on economy would ride roughshod over all other considerations, not excepting humanity itself. Late in January the Lords ordered the drafting of a paper setting forth their conclusions.[39] On March 4 this was discussed, approved, and ordered to be transcribed;[40] three days later it was signed and sent at once to Hillsborough.[41]

In a sense this lengthy document,[42] a compromise between Barrington's reactionary policy and Shelburne's colonizing plan, is an attempt at refutation of Shelburne's paper of October 5. It begins, as was customary, by professing that wide study characterized their work. Admitting the provisional character of the Proclamation of 1763 it declares that altered conditions may suggest a different system. Under four heads—Indian superintendents, trade, troops, settlements—it disposes of the whole affair. Superintendents are to continue to hear the complaints of the Indians, to renew compacts, negotiate land purchases, hold interviews, and distribute presents, but the governor and council of any colony are to enjoy the right to offer advice, and their consent is essential to the ratification of compacts—an impossible arrangement, we might observe. Trade is to be limited to specified posts in the south but not in the north, since one plan of trade is not suitable to all Indians. Illicit trade is held to be unpreventable, and, in the interest of economy, trade is to be entrusted entirely to the colonies. The troops are to abandon all forts and posts in the interior which are not needed for protecting the Indians and restraining the French and Spaniards. Niagara, Detroit and Michillimackinac are to be garrisoned by regulars. Settlements in the interior are regarded as a departure from precedent and contrary to the principles on which colonies are founded. Seaboard colonies alone accord with the mercantile system. The gradual pushing back of the frontier

---

[38] Franklin, *Works*, 4:374, B. Franklin to W. Franklin, January 9, 1768.

[39] Journal, 160, January 26, 1768.

[40] *Ibid.*, 182, March 4, 1768.

[41] *Ibid.*, 182, March 7, 1768.

[42] *Ibid.*, 183-204, March 7, 1768, "Representation of Lords of trade on the State of Indian Affairs."

line will encourage population, prevent manufacture, satisfy the land hunger of the colonists and preserve easy communication. Moreover, by implication the fur trade excludes settlement within the Indian hunting grounds. Far from serving to defend the old settlements, new ones would stand in need of protection; they would therefore be a liability, not an asset. The French already settled in Illinois and elsewhere are said to be so accustomed to military rule that there is no call for any other form. Anyhow they can be induced to settle elsewhere, in plain English they can be forcibly transported.

No little interest attaches to a comparison of the plans put forth by Barrington, Shelburne and Hillsborough, particularly since all three profess to be derived from the same sources. Barrington's plan was reactionary and narrow; it was the work of the military mind, the incompetent military mind. His outlook was very limited. The present was his one concern; he ignored, moreover, forces at work in the colonies. To him the military aspects of the situation were all important; the paramount issue was the prevention of any relaxing of military discipline or loss of fighting spirit. A charge more damning than mere incompetence is that of mental dishonesty, both in his attitude towards the Proclamation of 1763 and on the question of trade. In the one case he ignored the temporary character of the arrangement, in the other he continued to deny the loss of trade to the French via New Orleans, despite the outcries of eye witnesses and others who knew,[43] and to maintain the utter dependence of the Indians on the British no matter how the latter might decide to conduct business. In short he failed to comprehend the value of the territory in question just as his limited ability made it impossible for him to understand how complex and many-sided the problem really was.

Hillsborough too—for in the main the Lords of Trade voiced his sentiments—viewed the scene with a jaundiced eye. He too lacked breadth of vision, for, while he favored gradual expansion and progressive extension of the frontier line, he lived too completely in the present. Everything must yield to present economy whatever the ultimate loss. In his defense it may be said that he was the spokesman of the orthodox believers in the mercantile system and judged colonies by that standard, but that theory

[43] *Ibid.*, 84-87, Baynton and Wharton to Macleane, October 9, 1767. In this letter they estimate the loss at one hundred thousand pounds sterling annually.

of economics and colonization was losing its grip on the minds of men. The worst feature of his plan was its callous disregard of the rights of British subjects, the French-speaking inhabitants of Illinois, and its flouting even of their rights as men. To accomplish his purpose he was prepared to uproot these hapless war victims and perpetrate another 'Acadian horror' with not even the semblance of justification that existed in 1755.

Shelburne's plan was not perfect; it had its limitations, some of them serious. Some scholars detect in it the influence of Benjamin Franklin and Richard Jackson, but they do not maintain that this influence was excessive. Shelburne was not putty in the hands of those interested in western lands; Franklin indeed testified to the contrary. The truth is that Shelburne's desire to be fully informed, a desire sometimes carried to excess, prompted him to tap every promising source of information, and naturally some of this information he made his own. His mind was open to conviction; it was not closed to all views but his own. It may be urged that his plan shows little regard for colonial claims to western territory, the dependence of many British and American merchants on the fur trade, and the interests of those who had already invested in western lands. Shelburne was not unaware of this fact, but while he sought to reckon with all the factors involved, he knew that when interests conflicted some sacrifice of claims was unavoidable. A few individuals might suffer temporarily, but the general good would be promoted.

The one really serious defect was the failure of the plan to provide adequate protection for the Indians. Shelburne seems to have assumed that the aborigines would be civilized by contact with white men, or would remove from the vicinity of the new settlements, an assumption scarcely warranted by precedents or by Indian nature. It may be that he regarded as inevitable the encroachment of white men on Indian lands and the eventual displacement of the weaker race, so why try to prevent what must come to pass. Even so, at least some effort, if only a gesture in their behalf, was in order.

Whatever else may be said of Shelburne's policy it must be admitted that in the main it squared with the ideas of men so well informed and so diverse in character as Gage, Johnson, Croghan, Franklin, and that in itself was no mean accomplishment. It was a plan evolved slowly and conscientiously; it was broad in outlook, for it had regard to the future as well as the present. Moreover, it recognized the basic principle that in time

of peace British subjects, howsoever they became such, were entitled to civil government. If his plan does not entitle him to Disraeli's fulsome praise as the "ablest and most accomplished minister of the eighteenth century," it is not too much to say that of the three plans Shelburne's alone was statesmanlike. It did not overlook military needs or financial exigencies, but it did not stop with them or allow them to overshadow every other point. On the whole it was wise, reasonable, consistent, practical. So much cannot be predicated of the policy of Hillsborough and the Board of Trade. Was it not necessary within a few years to undo their work? Was not their failure to establish good order and the rule of law a reason for the Quebec Act?

In conclusion let it be said that Shelburne was truly interested in the west. He appreciated its possibilities; he wished by all means to preserve this vast and potentially valuable domain to the British flag. For the present he could not know that in 1783 when once more in power, by one of those strange quirks of history, he would consent to the handing over of this territory to the United States.

CHARLES METZGER

Osage Mission, a Factor in the Making of Kansas

The Osage Mission, located near the present site of St. Paul, Neosho County, Kansas, was established among the Osage tribe by the Jesuit Fathers in 1847. The history of this mission is significant because of the part it played in the development of Kansas, because of the genius of its missionaries, its long duration, and its numerous outposts flung across the southern part of the state. In addition, the numerous manuscript writings of the missionaries contain information which challenges a certain ideology long a traditional theme in Kansas history, namely the tradition that the state was peopled by anti-slavery crusaders.

The narrative of the Mission falls into three distinct periods: first, from its beginnings to 1847; second, between the years 1847 and 1870; and last, from the close of the Civil War to 1895. Its origin is developed against a background of government Indian policy, missionary endeavor, and Indian customs. During the years between 1847 and 1870 this institution was a compound of mission, farm, and manual labor school. It was likewise an entrepôt for supplies, a harbor for the ill and destitute, and a haven of protection in time of civil stress, not only for the Osage and their Indian neighbors, but also for the medley of white traders, mechanics, and stray settlers, always found within the vicinity of an Indian camp. In the third period of its history, the Osage Mission diverted its services from the redman to the white by ministering to the spiritual, temporal and intellectual needs of the incoming white population.

The Osage belonged to the Siouan family and, according to tribal tradition, dwelt at one time on the banks of the Wabash and Ohio rivers. Pressed by the stress of war, they gradually moved westward and settled near another river, probably the Mississippi. The same tradition tells that a division of the tribe occurred when the river overflowed its banks forcing the people to flee for safety. By tacit agreement, this accidental division of the tribe into separate village groups became permanent and gave rise to the terms Great and Little Osage.[1]

At the opening of the nineteenth century their central ren-

[1] Francis La Flesche, "The Osage Tribe: Rite of the Chiefs," *Thirty-Sixth Annual Report, Bureau of American Ethnology,* (1914-1915), 44-45.

dezvous was at the Great Osage Village in what is now Vernon County, Missouri, but they claimed all the territory west of the Mississippi to the Rockies, between the Missouri and the Arkansas rivers.[2] During the first quarter of the nineteenth century a number of turbulent outbreaks between the Osage and those Indians emigrating to their neighborhood led the United States Government to negotiate a series of treaties which resulted in the Osage being pushed beyond the border of Missouri and Arkansas to a reserve within the present states of Kansas and Oklahoma.[3]

Previous to 1815 our official relations with the Indians were confined to maikng treaties for peace or land cessions. After 1815 the activities of various missionary associations, and the demands of individual philanthropists, combined with the necessity for facing a climax in the policy of Indian removal, secured from the Government the first general appropriation for Indian education, the sum of $10,000. Since the Government possessed no administrative machinery for supervising the education of the Indian, the $10,000 was apportioned for that purpose among such misisonary organizations as were willing to undertake the work.

With this newly inaugurated policy of advancing Indian civilization, the Osage received their first resident missionaries and teachers. Two widely divergent missionary societies took an interest in the welfare of the tribe.[4] Between 1820 and 1830 the Presbyterians established five missionary stations among them; during these same years two Catholic missionaries, Father Charles De La Croix and Father Charles Van Quickenborne, visited the Osage on six different occasions.

A tremendous amount of self-sacrifice and much unrewarded effort accompanied the work of both groups; at the same time there was a noticeable difference in their aims and ultimate results. In organization, money, and men the Catholic Mission Society[5] was woefully lacking when compared with the financial

[2] J. J. Mathews, *Wah'kon-tah*, Norman, 1932, 345.

[3] These treaties can be found in Charles Kappler, *Indian Affairs Laws and Treaties*, Washington, 1904, Vol. II.

[4] The Indian Office Files, Department of the Interior, Washington, are rich in material relative to the activities of missionary societies. Other sources are the publications of Protestant organizations identified with Indian missions, such as the *Reports* of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, the United Missionary Society and the Kentucky Baptist Society for the Propagation of the Gospel among the Heathen.

[5] This was the official title used by the Society of Jesus of the vice-province of Missouri in its work among the Indians.

backing and membership of the societies that sponsored the efforts of the Presbyterian missionaries. Presbyterian activities were carried on by several dozen individuals, while Father Charles Van Quickenborne, S. J., labored almost alone in behalf of the Catholic Mission Society. In the final analysis, however, it was this zealous priest who was to have the more enduring influence, although he made no permanent establishment among the Osage. It was he who established St. Regis Seminary, the short-lived school for Indian boys at Florissant, Missouri. Several of the Osage youths who later became influential in their tribe were educated here.[6] It was among the Osage that Father Van Quickenborne first tested his plan for a Reduction similar to that which had been used in Paraguay.[7]

The thirties proved an unhappy decade for the Osage. From the time of Father Van Quickenborne's last visit to them in 1830 until 1838 they were without the services of a Catholic missionary. After 1837 the Presbyterians discontinued their work among the tribe. Abandoned by missionaries, neglected by the Government, and imposed upon by traders, the Osage in the late thirties were indeed in a deplorable condition. With the continual influx of emigrant tribes their hunting ground was moved so far to the west that finding game became a perilous pursuit. Added to the danger of attack by remote tribes, the factor of distance prevented their bringing home an adequate supply of meat. The least effort on the part of the Indians to improve their mode of life was discouraged by the traders who, in order to enrich themselves, urged the nation to continue to follow the chase. Their annuity was spent before its arrival. When the money was received it went to traders who had advanced goods, powder, and lead to the Indians. The natives, unversed in keeping accounts, knew little of the price of articles furnished them.

Finding themselves in excessive poverty, they sought aid from neighboring tribes. Repulsed in those quarters, they hunted for food among the sparse white settlements along the border of the Missouri and Arkansas, stole horses, and destroyed large stocks of cattle and hogs.

---

[6] Father Gilbert J. Garraghan, S. J., is the authority on nineteenth-century activities of the Society of Jesus in the Mississippi Valley. His article "St. Regis Seminary," *Catholic Historical Review*, IV (1919), 452-478, is a scholarly, detailed account of the second Catholic Indian school in the United States.

[7] Father Joseph P. Donnelly, S. J., "Nineteenth Century Jesuit Reductions in the United States," MID-AMERICA, XVII (April, 1935), 69-83; *Woodstock Letters*, XXV, 354-355.

Commissioners' reports agree in asserting that the Osage were a wild, predatory tribe that showed not the least sign of improvement. Strangely enough, the Government seemed content to let them remain so, and continually discouraged the various applications to erect missions and schools among these Indians.[8]

With the close of the decade of the thirties there was an indication of better days for the Osage in the visits made by several Jesuit missionaries. These Fathers came from the mission among the Potawatomi Indians at Sugar Creek in Linn County, one hundred miles northeast of the largest Osage village. Of these visits, made between 1838 and 1843 by Fathers C. Hoecken, Herman Aelen, and Felix Verrydt, we know only what the baptism and marriage records tell us.[9] Influence they must have had. It was while being visited by these missionaries that the Osage awakened from their lethargy. In 1843 the tribe petitioned the Government for a school to be established by Catholic missionaries and no others.[10]

The Government was willing to provide the Osage with a school, but was unwilling that it should be under sectarian control. The Osage, however, failed to be impressed by this specific refusal of the Government and continued their agitation for Catholic missionaries until the Society of Jesus agreed in 1847 to open the Osage Manual Labor School. Only after long and tedious negotiations did the Jesuits sign a contract with the Government on February 25, 1847.[11]

Father John Schoenmakers, S. J., Father John Bax., S. J., and three coadjutor brothers were sent from St. Louis to open the mission. They arrived at their destination on April 28, 1847. Following the greetings of the Osage, they examined the buildings. They found the two houses unfinished, and far too small to serve the purpose for which they were intended, that is, housing twenty pupils each with their teachers. Besides, they were incon-

---

[8] *The Reports of the Commissioners of Indian Affairs,* (1837-1839), summarize the condition of the Osage during the thirties. Hereinafter referred to as Report *CIA*. Additional matter may be found under the heading of *School File* in the Indian Office Files. Hereinafter referred to as IOF.

[9] These records can be found in the Archives of St. Mary's College and the Archives of the Church of the Immaculate Conception, St. Marys, Kansas.

[10] Petition of Osage Chiefs to President Tyler, 14 June 1843, *Osage File,* (1843), IOF.

[11] The manuscript correspondence covering these negotiations can be found in the *Indian Office Letter Books,* (1843-1847), and under *Osage File* and *School File* for the corresponding years, IOF.

veniently located near the east margin of the Osage country when they should have been in the center of the Indian villages. Only one village of about twenty-five wigwams was in the immediate vicinity, the others, ranging in distance from four to sixty miles, were scattered along the Neosho and Verdigris rivers. These inadequate, poorly located living quarters could but increase the heartaches and the difficulties involved in the establishment of a mission among a tribe so neglected and improvident.

Despite these unpromising conditions, preparations were begun at once for the opening of the school. Father Bax was sent to visit the various Indian camps in order to secure pupils. At first he met with little success because of the attitude of the Indian parents. They alleged that under the Presbyterian ministers, their children had learned nothing, were beaten daily and forced to work continuously without relief. In fact, an Indian father's most effective weapon in dealing with a stubborn son was to threaten to send him to school. But the adamant wall of Indian prejudice gradually crumbled under the charm of Father Bax's personality. With his supply of marbles and biscuits he soon dispelled even the fears of the children who, at first, had refused to come near him.[12]

In his travels, Father Bax found the Great and Little Osage, numbering about 5000 souls, living in small wigwams pitched along the banks of the Neosho and Verdigris rivers. The Great Osage, about 3500 in number, dwelt in several villages or towns ranging in distance from four to sixty miles from the mission. About twenty-two miles from the mission at a place called Timber Hills (near present Chetopa, Kansas), were the three encampments of the Little Osage that numbered about 1500 inhabitants.[13]

The Osage Manual Labor School was opened on May 10, 1847. There were only three half-breed boys in attendance; before the end of the month fourteen Indians and half-breeds were enrolled, and at the end of two months the number had risen to eighteen.[14]

The contract with the Government provided also for a girl's school. The Sisters of Loretto agreed to undertake the work, and

[12] *Annales de la Propagation de la Foi,* Lyon, XXIV.

[13] P. J. De Smet, S. J., *Western Missions and Missionaries,* New York, 1863, 355.

[14] *Account Book of the Osage Manual Labor School,* Archives of the Passionist Monastery, St. Paul, Kansas.

four of them, Mother Concordia, Sister Mary Petronilla, Sister Bridget and Sister Vincentia arrived at the Mission October 10, 1847.

Hardly two hours passed between the entrance of the Sisters into their poor log house and the arrival of their first boarders, three little half-breed girls and one full-blood Osage. The passing of time brought more boarders to both schools which daily became less and less habitable. Heavy rains washed out the chinking in the walls, which was supposed to be of mortar, but was actually mud whitened with lime. One of the chimneys had fallen down and two others were in danger of doing so. The plaster in the ceiling of the Sisters' house had given way. There was no barn, no meat-house nor any out-buildings whatsoever. For water the Sisters were dependent on the indifferent well at the boys' school.

The buildings were not only poorly constructed but also inadequate in size. Before the close of the year 1847 the boys' school was crowded to its capacity. In a house built for twenty persons fifty children were lodged. These crowded quarters, however, did not seem to retard the academic progress of the pupils. Both boys and girls were taught reading, writing and arithmetic. Three hours a day the boys spent in agriculture or domestic work, while the girls were taught to cook, sew, knit and draw.[15]

In spite of its many vicissitudes during the first seven years of its existence the Mission by 1854 had achieved something of a national reputation. Horace Greeley's *New York Tribune* referred to the Catholic Osage Mission on the Neosho river forty-five miles from Fort Scott as "one of the largest missions and schools in Kansas."[16] The same statement accompanied by a flattering pen and ink sketch of the Mission appeared in one of the "baedekers" of the day.[17] More significant than either of these appraisals were the reports of the Indian agents whose remarks on the missionaries and their work were never anything but commendatory.

The enrollment in both schools mounted perceptibly during the closing years of the fifties, but the increase was not at all

---

[15] Schoenmakers to Richardson, August, 1848, *Report CIA.*, (1848). Paul Mary Ponziglione, S. J., *The Osage and Father John Schoenmakers, S. J.*, II, Chapters 2 and 12. Hereinafter referred to as *O. F. S.* These manuscript *Memoirs* in the Archives of the Missouri Province of the Society of Jesus, St. Louis, Missouri, are indispensable for the early history of the Osage Mission. Hereinafter referred to as AMP.

[16] *New York Tribune*, 23 June 1854.

[17] Edward E. Hale, *Kanza and Nebraska*, Boston, 1854, 136.

indicative of a settled condition among the Osage; in fact they were growing increasingly restless. Many of them wished to reduce the extent of their reserve in order to free themselves from the intrusion of whites who were destroying their timber and carrying on illegal trade within the reserve.

With the outbreak of the Civil War the Mission found itself in a dangerous position because it stood on the dividing line between the Northern and Southern forces. Passing troops never failed to leave their mark on the Indian country. With something akin to diabolic ruthlessness they plundered Indian cottages, destroyed fields and set fire to schools and churches. But the Mission they spared; it was sacred ground where the flag of truce was always hoisted.[18]

Strangely enough, these hectic months, with the danger of attack just in the offing, did not interfere with the routine in the schools. The agent's report for 1863 pointed out that the enrollment of students, one hundred and forty-one, could be increased if the buildings were larger. He spoke of the institution as a "model of industrious habits, cleanliness, order and system," which reflected "credit on its worthy superintendent and all connected with its management."[19]

Even before the foregoing report was written the Osage had signed a treaty which as far as the Manual Labor School was concerned marked the beginning of its end. Following the destruction of their farms or villages in the more turbulent months of the war, many of the Osage had moved farther west; in 1863 they wandered back to their former camping ground only to find it dotted with the dugout, tent or cabin of white squatters brought there by the Homestead Act of 1862. Daily, white immigrations into Kansas increased, the newcomers demanded more land, and the Government sought to secure it by negotiating with the Osage for their extensive reserve. By 1870 the Osage had ceded to the Government all their lands in Kansas and had moved to their new reserve in the Indian Territory.

Government officials offered to move the mission to the new territory where the Fathers, in accordance with treaty stipulations, were free to choose the most suitable site for a school. But Father Schoenmakers was directed by his superiors not to enter into this transaction and the Osage were destined to begin life in a new land without the immediate aid of an influence

---

[18] *O. F. S.*, IV, 297-298.
[19] Elder to Coffin, 20 September 1863, *Report CIA.*, (1863).

that had guarded and guided them during twenty-three consecutive years.

Perhaps no other Indian school had been established and discontinued with as much reluctance as that of the Osage. As early as 1855 with the first impact of white settlers, the Fathers had seen the handwriting on the wall but their hopes had been steadied somewhat by a mounting attendance which reached the high peak of one hundred and ninety in 1861. Then came the war, the Homestead Act, and railroad expansion with their effect on the enrollment which dropped from one hundred and sixteen to eighty-two in 1868.[20] In spite of a dwindling attendance from 1863 on, every agent or commissioner who inspected the institution during these years pleaded with Washington for its continuance. As one agent put it, "a greater calamity than the closing of the Osage Mission School could not befall the tribe."[21] After 1868 the institution was definitely a white school, although the Osage in fluctuating numbers continued to attend it.

In its work of civilizing and Christianizing the Indians the Osage Mission was not by any means an unqualified success. But the missionaries realized that the work of bringing aborigines from barbarism to civilization and thence to Christianity was a labor not of a few years but of centuries. The span of the Mission's existence, twenty-three years, was too brief to yield significant effects. The fighting against time, however, was a minor obstacle compared with the scarcity of missionaries, the fatiguing conditions under which they worked, and the detrimental Indian policy of the Government coupled with inconsistency and neglect.

A continual drawback was the dearth of missionaries. As long as the Mission was an Indian establishment there were never more than three priests and sometimes only two. If there were three, only one was free to devote himself to the full-bloods. And following up groups that moved with every change of season did not make for rapid progress in converting them. The missionary did well if he kept them friendly or interested enough to send their children to the Mission school.

Among the half-breed Osage better results were obtained. They in particular had profited by the educational opportunities offered at the Mission schools; they spoke English and French fluently, possessed well stocked farms superior to those of their

[20] *Report CIA.*, (1861, 1865, 1868).
[21] Elder to Coffin, 15 September 1864, *Report CIA.*, (1864).

white neighbors, and aided considerably through their example and material assistance in the civilization of the full-bloods.

Rapid conversions were thwarted by another difficulty, that of language. Until they had acquired a speaking knowledge of Osage the missionaries had to depend on half-breed interpreters who were numerous enough, though few of them were capable of changing the words of the catechism into comprehensible Osage the missionaries had to depend on half-breed interpreters tion and Christianization of the Osage were polygamy and liquor. The practice of polygamy was largely dictated by greed, since it was customary in public ceremonies as well as private visitations for an Indian to receive gifts in proportion to the number of his wives. Slowly but none the less surely the missionaries succeeded in abolishing this practice. More formidable was the Indians' use of liquor which was just so much poison that served to hurry him to a premature grave. Its excessive use caused scurvy, a disease capable of depopulating in one season an entire town.

Even had the foregoing conditions not existed, failure or at least a modicum of success was endemic in the Government's Indian policy characterized as it was by the harmful practice of annuity payments. These latter served as a paradise for swindlers and an opiate to Indian enterprise and self-reliance. The Osage annuity amounted to $20,000 a year; $8,000 of this amount was to be used for goods, provisions, stock, and the remainder was to be paid in cash to the tribe. For the $8,000 the Osage received either goods they had not ordered, or articles so badly damaged that they were not useful. Little or none of the remaining $12,000 reached the Indian; it was usually spent before its arrival since traders had sold them goods on credit (at fabulous prices) to the full amount of their annuity.[22]

These irregularities naturally affected the progress of the Mission since it had to provide from its all too slender resources food, clothing and medicine for the Indians who had not fared so well at the annuity payment. The Mission finances were in no condition to take on added burdens. Between 1847 and the treaty of 1865, six dollars was the average monthly allowance received from the Indian educational fund for the board, tuition and clothing of the Osage children. Between 1847 and 1868, $12,000 over and above the money received from the Govern-

[22] Elder to Coffin, 12 September 1862, *Report CIA.*, (1862).

ment was spent for the support of the schools, the repair of the buildings, and the civilizing of the Indians. This sum represented contributions from the Jesuits, the Propagation of the Faith, and relatives and friends in Europe. In spite of these donations an atmosphere of continual insecurity hung over the Mission, a fact which is reflected in the annual Osage reports. Whether from missionaries or agents these letters had one invariable theme: pleas for prompt and increased allowances. Just as constant was the Government's disregard of these petitions.

From the Indian agents' reports, we get a glimpse of the other side, that is the brighter aspect, of the Osage Mission. Their reports consistently praised the work that was being done among the Indians by the Jesuits and the Sisters of Loretto. Though the missionaries evaluated the results of their efforts among the Indians with less enthusiasm than did the agents, yet they were not without assurance that their labors had been in many respects successful. They knew that if the Osage had not taken up arms against the Government during the Civil War, if they were restrained in their attacks on the homes of pioneer white settlers, this was owing in great part to the influence exerted by the missionaries.

The Jesuits must have derived some solace from the knowledge that they had been able to baptize 3,000 Osage, even though the greater number of these were children, or adults who received the Sacrament on their death bed. Rather significant is the fact that George White Hair, Gratamantze, and Little White Hair, head chiefs of the Osage Nation during the Mission's existence, all died in the Church.

The significance of the Indian educational work at the Mission was that it proved the Osage to be as capable as any other children of acquiring an education. From time to time specimens of the work done at both schools were thought worthy enough to be sent to Washington to either the Commissioners of Indian Affairs or the Secretary of the Interior and always these officials seemed to be well impressed.

Some of the Indian boys became such proficient penmen that they were employed by the traders to write letters and keep books. For this work a lad fourteen years of age could earn twenty dollars a month, a rather large sum when one remembers that at the time some Indian subagents were being paid a little more than sixty dollars a month. Three of the boys reared at the Osage Manual Labor School became chiefs of the Nation and

during their administrations did much to keep their people from plundering and murdering the whites settled along the Missouri and Arkansas borders.

Education was even a greater boon for the Indian girls since it sounded the death-knell to polygamy which had kept many of them in virtual slavery. Among the Osage girls reared at the Convent two joined the Sisters of Loretto.

For us of the twentieth century the importance of the Osage Mission lies not in its accomplishments as a civilizer of the Indians, but rather in its contributions to the civil and cultural needs of the pioneering white settlers in southeastern Kansas. But the point is likely to be overlooked that it was the Osage who pleaded for the missionaries to come to Kansas. Without the Indian, there would have been no Mission.

White settlement of Kansas was not a steady process. It was more or less a spasmodic infiltration. The first arrivals were the trader element, followed by a few mechanics. They lived in or near the Indian camps and were never numerous enough to form, in the strict sense of the word, anything even remotely approaching a settlement. The first permanent settlements came after the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, an influx that made no significant increase in the white population of the southeastern corner of the territory which remained essentially an Indian country until the Civil War. The close of this conflict along with the Osage Treaty of 1865 and the modified Homestead Act paved the way for a great ex-soldier immigration. It was this group that really settled southeastern Kansas where, for the next ten years, "a man without an army record was something of a curiosity." Another influx of whites came in the seventies following an extensive advertising campaign by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, the wide publicity given the state at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition, and the well-organized immigration activities of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad. The new arrivals came from all parts of the East, the North, and a few from the South, but they all had one thing in common: poverty.[23]

To each of these foregoing groups the Mission rendered a signal service. White men and their families residing at trading posts were visited regularly by the Fathers from the Mission during their circuits of the Osage villages or those of a neigh-

[23] C. E. Cory, "The Osage Ceded Lands," *Kansas State Historical Society Collections*, VIII, 188.

boring tribes. In the fifties the Mission was something of a beacon light to the few scouts, weary teamsters, or perplexed travelers who stopped for rest, refreshment and supplies for which they frequently paid nothing. Not infrequently the missionaries rescued individuals lost on the plains or gave timely aid to the more adventurous who attempted to make a home on the prairie.

During the sixties the Mission was first a refuge during the civil strife, then at its close a pivotal center for white settlement, since the section in which it was located offered a certain amount of land where the labor of wrestling with a virgin soil had already been performed by Indian farmers. Other attractive features of the locality were the two-well-organized schools. For the Catholic element there was the advantage of a church and the proximity of a priest. In the decades of the seventies and in the succeeding ones the Osage Mission stood for single achievement, that of spreading Catholic culture.

The chief agents in the spread of Catholic culture through southeastern Kansas were the missionaries. Fundamentally, they were shock troopers sent into a pagan region under the cohesive and directive force of a religious organization in order to spread Christianity. The missionaries' primary purpose, gathering souls to Christ, brought with it a secondary function, that of a cultural and civilizing agent of the first rank. Through education they raised the intellectual level of their converts. By the doctrine they preached plus their own influence for good, they ennobled what once was crass, savage and unmoral. In providing for their own material wants they created a spirit of industry that was contagious. As leaders in fostering agriculture and cattle raising, they promoted material and economic welfare. In their ministrations to the needy, in their care of the sick, they were in times of distress and misfortune harbingers of security and charity.

All of these achievements were accomplished in varying degrees by three groups at the Osage Mission: the Jesuit fathers and coadjutor brothers, and the Sisters of Loretto. Within these groups were certain individuals who by reason of their personality and achievements towered above the commonplace. Among them were Father Schoenmakers, Father Bax, Father Ponziglione, Father Colleton, Mother Bridget and some half dozen Jesuit brothers.

In Father Schoenmakers were combined the duties of supe-

during their administrations did much to keep their people from plundering and murdering the whites settled along the Missouri and Arkansas borders.

Education was even a greater boon for the Indian girls since it sounded the death-knell to polygamy which had kept many of them in virtual slavery. Among the Osage girls reared at the Convent two joined the Sisters of Loretto.

For us of the twentieth century the importance of the Osage Mission lies not in its accomplishments as a civilizer of the Indians, but rather in its contributions to the civil and cultural needs of the pioneering white settlers in southeastern Kansas. But the point is likely to be overlooked that it was the Osage who pleaded for the missionaries to come to Kansas. Without the Indian, there would have been no Mission.

White settlement of Kansas was not a steady process. It was more or less a spasmodic infiltration. The first arrivals were the trader element, followed by a few mechanics. They lived in or near the Indian camps and were never numerous enough to form, in the strict sense of the word, anything even remotely approaching a settlement. The first permanent settlements came after the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, an influx that made no significant increase in the white population of the southeastern corner of the territory which remained essentially an Indian country until the Civil War. The close of this conflict along with the Osage Treaty of 1865 and the modified Homestead Act paved the way for a great ex-soldier immigration. It was this group that really settled southeastern Kansas where, for the next ten years, "a man without an army record was something of a curiosity." Another influx of whites came in the seventies following an extensive advertising campaign by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture, the wide publicity given the state at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition, and the well-organized immigration activities of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad. The new arrivals came from all parts of the East, the North, and a few from the South, but they all had one thing in common: poverty.[23]

To each of these foregoing groups the Mission rendered a signal service. White men and their families residing at trading posts were visited regularly by the Fathers from the Mission during their circuits of the Osage villages or those of a neigh-

[23] C. E. Cory, "The Osage Ceded Lands," *Kansas State Historical Society Collections*, VIII, 188.

boring tribes. In the fifties the Mission was something of a beacon light to the few scouts, weary teamsters, or perplexed travelers who stopped for rest, refreshment and supplies for which they frequently paid nothing. Not infrequently the missionaries rescued individuals lost on the plains or gave timely aid to the more adventurous who attempted to make a home on the prairie.

During the sixties the Mission was first a refuge during the civil strife, then at its close a pivotal center for white settlement, since the section in which it was located offered a certain amount of land where the labor of wrestling with a virgin soil had already been performed by Indian farmers. Other attractive features of the locality were the two-well-organized schools. For the Catholic element there was the advantage of a church and the proximity of a priest. In the decades of the seventies and in the succeeding ones the Osage Mission stood for single achievement, that of spreading Catholic culture.

The chief agents in the spread of Catholic culture through southeastern Kansas were the missionaries. Fundamentally, they were shock troopers sent into a pagan region under the cohesive and directive force of a religious organization in order to spread Christianity. The missionaries' primary purpose, gathering souls to Christ, brought with it a secondary function, that of a cultural and civilizing agent of the first rank. Through education they raised the intellectual level of their converts. By the doctrine they preached plus their own influence for good, they ennobled what once was crass, savage and unmoral. In providing for their own material wants they created a spirit of industry that was contagious. As leaders in fostering agriculture and cattle raising, they promoted material and economic welfare. In their ministrations to the needy, in their care of the sick, they were in times of distress and misfortune harbingers of security and charity.

All of these achievements were accomplished in varying degrees by three groups at the Osage Mission: the Jesuit fathers and coadjutor brothers, and the Sisters of Loretto. Within these groups were certain individuals who by reason of their personality and achievements towered above the commonplace. Among them were Father Schoenmakers, Father Bax, Father Ponziglione, Father Colleton, Mother Bridget and some half dozen Jesuit brothers.

In Father Schoenmakers were combined the duties of supe-

rior and procurator of the Mission, spiritual father to the Sisters of Loretto, doctor, steward, lawyer, judge, catechist and preacher to the Indians.[24] Father Schoenmakers' co-worker during these first years was Father John Bax, a Belgian by birth. This thirty-year-old Jesuit was an eloquent speaker, with an extraordinary facility in acquiring languages. Within a short time after his arrival at the Mission, he had acquired so thorough a knowledge of the Osage tongue that the Indians said he spoke it better than themselves. So intense was that ardor, so unceasing his toil that at thirty-five, despite a strong constitution, he was a broken man. He died during an epidemic in 1852.[25]

After Father Bax's death, the Osage came to Father Schoenmakers in time of trouble or need. They knew that somehow he would provide them with bread and shelter. They knew that he would take care of them during illness. To him they were indebted for encouragement in farming. He went with them to their fields, showed them how to till the soil and to plant their crops; he paid them to cut the rails with which they fenced their fields, gave them his own team for hauling purposes and finally furnished them with seed and stock.[26]

From 1851 to 1864 Father Schoenmakers served as postmaster of Catholic Mission. The only other postoffice in that region was at the military post, Fort Scott. Handling mail in that day seemed to be the postmaster's minor duty when compared with the other services he was called upon to give. The scattered white settlers expected him to order their provisions, their wearing apparel, their farm implements and such luxuries as magazines. And when they settled their accounts, he handled the remittances for them. On his business trips to St. Louis, his shopping list included not only the needs of the Mission but also those of the families settled in the region. A spirit of helpfulness led him to serve all conscientiously. When it became apparent that the Osage were to be pushed beyond the borders of Kansas, Father Schoenmakers donated to the Mission Town Company, which he himself organized, 160 acres along the southwestern corner of the Jesuit property. From this land was

[24] Biographical data on Father Schoenmakers can be found in Ponziglione, *Western Mission Journal*, VI, 17-18, AMP; W. W. Graves, *Life and Letters of Father John Schoenmakers*, Parsons, Kansas, 1928, 6-10.

[25] The two written sources for Father Bax's work at the Mission are the baptism, marriage and burial *Registers* in the Archives of the Passionist Monastery, Saint Paul, and his letters, three in number, published in De Smet, *Western Missions and Missionaries*.

[26] Ponziglione, *Western Mission Journal*, VI, 20-21, AMP.

plotted the original boundaries of the town, Osage Catholic Mission, more familiarly called Osage Mission until 1895 when it became St. Paul.

In keeping with the kaleidoscopic changes through which the Mission was passing was the change in the Osage Manual Labor School, now attended mostly by white children. A division was made in the institution with the granting of a charter on May 7, 1870, to the Jesuits for a boys' school to be known as the Saint Francis Institution for Boys. On August 17 of the same year the Sisters of Loretto took out a charter incorporating their school under the name of St. Ann's Academy.

The educators at the Mission were the Sisters of Loretto and the Jesuit lay-brothers. In a sense they were the sustaining force of the institution but we have very few records of their work because their life with its round of teaching, cooking, washing, sewing and tending the sick did not lend itself to chronicling. Nevertheless, it was their careful performance of these prosaic tasks that made life at Osage Mission endurable.

The name of Mother Bridget Hayden, superior of the Sisters of Loretto at the Mission from 1859 until her death in 1890, has become a household word among the families of southeastern Kansas. She was particularly beloved by the Indians over whom she had an unusual influence. With the influx of white settlers, Sunday processions to the convent were proverbial. Young mothers came to Mother Bridget for advice about their babies, or for a remedy for poison ivy. Distracted wives whose husbands drank to excess sought her counsel. Young girls desiring an education came to her, confident that they would not be turned away.[27]

In the spring of 1891 St. Francis Institution was discontinued. At that time the Jesuits were conducting two boys' schools in Kansas, the other being at St. Marys. Because of their proximity to each other it was decided to close one, and that one was St. Francis Institution. Four years later, St. Ann's Academy was destroyed by fire. The insurance amounting to $16,000 could not begin to reconstruct what had originally cost $75,000. The Academy was never reopened.

Outstanding among the missionaries connected with the Osage Mission were Father Paul Mary Ponziglione, an Italian nobleman, and Father Phillip Colleton. Father Ponziglione saw

---

[27] Mrs. Ed. McCall, *Reminiscences of St. Ann's Academy*, MS in the Files of W. W. Graves, St. Paul, Kansas. Mrs. McCall, who attended St. Ann's Academy, knew Mother Bridget.

Kansas grow from an Indian camping ground to a state, a development in which he played an important part. He was the pioneer who traveled from the Osage Mission to establish missionary stations which became the nuclei of permanent settlements and centers of culture in southeastern Kansas.

Whenever two or three Catholic families were to be found, Father Ponziglione collected them at some central point in a cabin, tent, or house which he had converted into a temporary chapel. First confessions were heard, then came Mass and Holy Communion, followed by a sermon. The baptism of children and adults, and visits to the sick completed the day's work. In the course of time, these small settlements grew into towns, and non-Catholics as well as Catholics attended the Divine Services which were held in the town hall or schoolhouse. Generally, after a few years had passed, a modest church was erected on land given by the town corporation with money donated by those of the Faith and by those outside it.[28]

Father Colleton's missionary circuit extended from the western border of Missouri to the eastern line of Colorado. He devoted himself to the railroad construction gangs and soldiers to be found in the many camps that dotted the southern part of Kansas during the heyday of railroad building.[29]

The story of the Mission, woven as it was into the life of the people whom it served, challenges a certain ideology which has been a traditional theme in Kansas history, that is, that the state was peopled by anti-slavery crusaders. The state's claim to uniqueness lies not in the spirit motivating the majority of its settlers, but rather in the fact that its ministers of the Gospel and its educators preceded rather than followed settlement.

Within the brief compass of six years, 1890 to 1896, much that was historic in southern Kansas had passed away. Its oldest educational institutions, St. Francis and St. Ann's had ceased to exist. Two pioneering Orders, the Jesuits and the Sisters of Loretto moved away. Even the name was changed to St. Paul in 1895. Yet the memory of Osage Mission lingers on where it planted the seeds for so much that has been fruitful along the Santa Fé Trail.

SISTER MARY PAUL FITZGERALD

---

[28] *Litterae Annuae Missionis St. Francisci de Hieronymo*, (1854-1889), AMP. A fuller treatment of Father Ponziglione's activities is found in "A Jesuit Circuit Rider," in MID-AMERICA, XVIII, (July, 1936), 182-198.

[29] There are several of Father Colleton's letters published in *Letters and Notices*, Roehampton, VII, 12-16; 77-78; 317; 366-369.

La Salle, 1669-1673

Where was La Salle journeying from October 1669 to the beginning of 1673? This question has divided historians into several camps. The answer of one group is that La Salle explored the Ohio; others contend that besides the exploration of the Ohio River at this time as far as the rapids near Louisville, he reached the great river on another journey by way of the Great Lakes. In either opinion La Salle found the Mississippi before the epochal expedition of Marquette and Jolliet in June 1673. Those in this country who have discussed the question decided almost unanimously against La Salle as the finder of the upper Mississippi.

This dispute over priority of discovery arose solely through the ingrained prejudice of one man, Pierre Margry, Curator of the Archives of France. To convince the world that La Salle was "the prince of explorers," as great if not greater than Cortés, Pizarro, and other Spanish *Conquistadores,* had become an *idée fixe* with Margry. This zeal for the cause of Robert Cavelier sprang in part from an antipathy toward the Jesuits that was little short of a phobia, and laboring under this complex prejudice, the French archivist compiled his much-quoted edition of documents on the discovery and exploration of the Mississippi Valley.[1] La Salle in truth never laid claim to the rôle of discoverer of the Mississippi as established for him by Margry,[2] yet he did ambition a place among the great conquerors. Hurt in pride because a mere Canadian of humble birth, Louis Jolliet, and Marquette, to whom he was formerly a Jesuit

---

[1] Pierre Margry, *Découvertes et Etablissements des Français dans l'Ouest et dans le Sud de l'Amérique Septentrionale, 1614-1754,* Paris, 1876-1888.

[2] It is very interesting to note the various views entertained with regard to the Jolliet-Marquette expedition of 1673. La Salle disparaged the Jolliet narratives; Margry claimed that La Salle preceded the Jesuit and the Canadian; Cohesnel is "willing to concede that Jolliet and Marquette descended the Mississippi down to the 33°, but . . . denies that they were the first"; two Franciscans denied that the expedition ever took place at all, Father Douay, in Chrestien Leclercq, *Premier establissement de la Foy,* Paris, 1691, II, 364-366, and Father Hennepin, *Nouvelle Decouverte,* Utrecht, 1697, 293-294; the latter states as a conclusive proof that Jolliet told him that he never went down the Mississippi, but remained among the Huron and Ottawa Indians. Gabriel Gravier is of opinion that the expedition really took place; he generously puts it on a par with the two explorations of the Great River by La Salle in 1671 and 1672. Both Jesuits and Franciscans are wrong, he says, the first for denying the priority of La Salle, the second for saying that the Jolliet-Marquette expedition never took place at all.

confrere,[3] had anteceded his arrival at the legendary river, La Salle manipulated the names of rivers of the Valley to show that he had found something different from what they found, and, moreover, that *the* great river of the Valley was not the Mississippi but the Chuckagoa of De Soto. His re-discovery of this latter would link him with a *Conquistador*. He disparaged Jolliet as an explorer and observer and decried the young Canadian's narrative as teeming with "great mistakes";[4] still he never attributed to himself the journeys ascribed to him by Margry and his followers, Gravier, Chesnel, and others.

Francis Parkman, whose opinion was of great weight in this country, held that La Salle's priority in the Mississippi discovery had not been proved, but, he wrote, that "he discovered the Ohio may be regarded as established."[5] If Parkman had been allowed to check the documents supplied to him by Margry, he would have held differently. John Gilmary Shea in an acknowledgment to Parkman for his *Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century* told Parkman he had allowed himself to be influenced by Margry, who belongs, wrote Shea, to the mocking section of the younger French generation of France. When Parkman communicated this news to Margry, he did not deny this influence, but rather remarked that he sent Shea what appears to be a flippant answer.[6] How Parkman should have been influenced by a man like Margry is beyond the concern of this essay.

Another appraisal of Margry's well known work has to be made unfortunately at this late date, and in this study the conviction grows firm that Margry by publishing documents to his own purpose has obstructed and confused scholarship through several generations. Such a realization comes when his printed page is compared with the document, and the omissions, additions, changes, and other liberties taken with the originals stand revealed. The first three of his six volumes of documents treat almost exclusively of La Salle. To say nothing of the badly edited texts of copies made by Margry, changes in the punctuation of the original occur distorting the author's meaning. Dates

---

[3] Marc de Villiers du Terrage, *La découverte du Missouri et l'histoire du fort d'Orléans, 1673-1728*, Paris, 1925, 11.

[4] Margry, II, 81, 168, 178, 244, etc.

[5] *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, Boston, 1907, 25.

[6] "Letters of Francis Parkman to Pierre Margry, with an Introductory note by John Spencer Bassett," in *Smith College Studies in History*, VIII, 1923, 129; hereinafter quoted as *Smith College Studies*.

of certain documents are omitted, and, considering the aim of the compiler, not accidentally. Some documents are abridged, or synopsized, or cut into several sections and printed at random through the volumes. Italics are used where the editor thought a passage proved his point, or even to no purpose, and are lacking when the author of the document underscored a passage. These items, together with the division of the compilation "into chapters with bastard titles as those of a sensational newspaper,"[7] and the choice of documents, make it quite evident that the prime intent of the compiler was to prove a cherished thesis.[8]

Not a few of the materials selected were already known to American scholars,[9] while some of the more important had been published in translation in *Documents Relative to the Colonial History of New York,* with this difference that where the American publication gave the document in full, Margry was satisfied with printing an extract. To him the fundamental rule of the context meant nothing. Nor is the provenience of the document stated, except in a confused manner at the end of the third volume for the contents of the first three volumes, and Margry did not see fit to state whether the document he supposedly had seen was the original or a copy, and if a copy, whether an early or a late one. Until the Library of Congress had had photostats or true copies made and checked by disinterested experts, it was

---

[7] John G. Shea, *The Bursting of Pierre Margry's La Salle Bubble,* New York, 1879; this tract first appeared in the *New York Freeman's Journal.*

[8] Margry's compilation does not even belong to that class spoken of by Bernheim, "welche mit tendenziöser Auswahl aus umfangreichen Material ausgehoben sind . . . ohne das die einzelnen Dokumente sebst gefälsche wären," *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode,* Leipzig, 1894, 249. Henri Lorin, *Le Comte de Frontenac,* Paris, 1895, xii, "Parmi les documents, tous reproduits avec grand soin et références aux collections originales, il en est qui paraissent de pure polémique et d'assez médiocre valeur." When the document is compared with the printed page, very little care is noticed. Pierre Heinrich, *La Louisiane sous la Compagnie des Indes,* 1717-1731, Paris, n. d., xiv, speaking of Margry's compilation, "auquel on peut reprocher son arbitraire dans le choix des pièces publiées." Cf. Ernest Gâgnon, *Louis Jolliet,* Montreal, 1926, 16-17. De Villiers was led astray by the arbitrariness of the selection. From a letter of Bernou to Renaudot, Margry, III, 74, de Villiers in his "La Louisiane, Histoire de son nom et de ses frontières successives, 1684-1819, in *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris,* XXI, n. s., 1929, 19, concluded that Bernou was not on friendly terms with La Salle. It is evident when this letter of Bernou is replaced where it belongs in the series, that Bernou was not unfriendly toward La Salle at this time, nor was La Salle unfriendly toward Bernou.

[9] In the first volume there were two documents which Parkman had not seen, Parkman to Margry, 1876, August 8, *Smith College Studies,* VIII, 169. They were Tonty's relation and the "accusations piquantes de Frontenac," the nature of the latter document will appear later. Cf. also Parkman to Margry, 1882, October 17, *ibid.,* 196.

difficult to pass judgment on the compilation, and the student was compelled to rely upon Margry's defective copies.

Margry published the first article in which La Salle's priority to the discovery of the Mississippi was asserted, in 1862.[10] Thereafter, he held over the heads of American scholars the threat that they would have to revise their concepts about the beginnings of the history of the great Valley, asserting that he had in his possession materials proving their former ideas erroneous. Meanwhile, he used his official position as archivist to impede American investigators and to prevent them from profiting from the contents of the Archives of Paris. The story of how Margry's six volumes came to be published has been told.[11] Additional light was thrown upon the subject when Parkman's letters to Margry were printed.[12]

After the failure of Harrisse to raise the money for publication, Parkman made use of his influence with members of Congress to have voted a subsidy of ten thousand dollars to print the papers, which Margry had given them to understand contained much more than he chose to disclose. "Whatever Margry was to other men, to Parkman he was a man honored and esteemed for his character," wrote the author of the preface of the letters of Parkman to Margry. After reading this correspondence, one has a higher idea of the forbearing kindness of Parkman and a correspondingly low estimate of Margry's character. The present writer not having seen the letters of Margry to Parkman, judges the former solely on Parkman's answers, and he sees Margry as suspicious, distrustful, and petty by nature, apparently a hypocondriac and completely without appreciation of his debt to Parkman.[13] That Parkman knew of Margry's prejudices is evident from his warning against including propaganda papers among those about to be published under the

---

[10] "Les Normands dans les Vallées de l'Ohio et du Mississippi," in *Journal Général de l'Instruction publique*, July-September, 1862.

[11] J. Winsor, *Narrative and Critical History of America*, Boston and New York, 1884, V, 241-245; cf. Parkman, *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, Boston, 1907, Preface to the Eleventh Edition, vii-x; Charles Hought Farnham, *A Life of Francis Parkman*, Boston, 1900, 155-157.

[12] *Smith College Studies*, VIII, 123-206.

[13] "Vous m'accusez d'avoir manqué de courage parceque je n'ai pas trouvé un libraire pour entreprendre la publication de votre collection. En effêt j'aurais pu en trouver un à condition de le garantir personnellement de toute perte, ce que je n'ai pas voulu faire. Aussi j'ai travaillé tout l'hiver pour porter congrès à vous voter de l'argent." Parkman to Margry, 1876, May 8, *ibid.*, 166.

auspices of Congress.[14] Parkman knew also that if Congress was willing to finance publication of documents to make them more accessible to students of the history of the Valley, Congress was not willing to waste public funds by printing seventeenth-century French lampoons, or idiosyncracies of a nineteenth-century *petit bourgeois*.[15]

At the time of publication, since nobody was able either to view the original documents or the copies made by Margry, the question of their authenticity was raised by suspicious scholars in England and France. An unsavory incident was recalled. The honesty of the compiler had been questioned before, for to prove that French and not Portuguese navigators were first to reach the Guinea Coast of Africa,[16] Margry had previously produced a document of exceedingly amazing provenience.[17] Yet in spite of the wariness of some scholars, a similar document was slipped in and published, as shall be seen, by Margry among those for North America in *Découvertes et Etablissments des Français*. Parkman was not aware of what had taken place in 1867-1868, as is clear from his letter of February 12, 1877, acknowledging the arrival of the proof-sheets for the first volume of the collection. Parkman adds in the letter:

> That gentleman whom you know (Henry Harrisse) is beginning to get busy. A professor of Harvard University, of which I am one of the trustees, wrote to him last December to ask for some information about a point of French law. M(onsieur) H(arrisse) inserted in his answer a few lines of postscript which the professor sent me. Here they are: "If you should meet Mr. Francis Parkman, tell him to be very careful how he uses the documents in Mr. Margry's new book. I have a letter from Mr. Meyer,

---

[14] Parkman to Margry, 1873, May 1, *ibid.*, 140. Cf. Margry, Introduction to volume IV, iii, where the compiler says that in this volume and in those following, he would be "plus libre que je ne l'étais pour la publication des trois volumes qui précèdent où bien des passions sont en jeu . . . ," that is, Margry resented the fact that he was not allowed to print more propaganda papers.

[15] The Introductions are not found in the American edition.

[16] *Les Navigations françaises et la Révolution maritime du XIVe au XVIe siècle, d'après les documents inédits tirés de France, d'Angleterre, d'Espagne et d'Italie*, Paris, 1867. The first section entitled: "Les marins de Normandie aux côtes de Guinée avant les Portugais," 11-70, is a fine example of romantic mid-nineteenth century sentimentality in historical research.

[17] Cf. Richard Henry Major's preface to *Select Letters of Christopher Columbus*, Second Edition, London, 1870, xlv-xlviii, where this author takes Margry to task for having "put forth the empty pretension that the discovery of America was due to the influence of French teaching." The point at issue was the date of publication of the *Imago Mundi* of Pierre d'Ailly. "M. Margry," says Major, "indeed *asserts*, but without giving his authority, that in the Columbian Library at Seville are d'Ailly's treatises *printed at Nuremberg in 1472*. This is in contravention of all the bibliographers . . ."

Professor in the College of France (College de France), and one of the commission appointed by the State for publishing historical documents, stating that the reason why they always declined publishing Mr. Margry's documents is that they are not convinced of their authenticity and ascribed his always refusing to exhibit the originals or stating where they are to the belief that some of them have been manufactured by Mr. de Rosny."

This same professor told me that Mr. Harrisse has a brother employed in one of the departments at Washington. I wrote to Mr. Spofford (The Librarian of the Library of Congress) to put him on guard against the proventions that they might try to insinuate. It is unnecessary to remind you of the importance of indicating at the end of the third volume at the latest, the provenience of all the documents. It is true that they speak for themselves, but there are few people intelligent enough or sufficiently educated to fully appreciate the testimony of their internal evidence, and anyway we must forestall all protests.

Who is this M. de Rosny? I think I correctly decifered this name, although badly written in the letter of M. H.[18]

The answer to Parkman's last question is found in the Preface of Major's book on Prince Henry of Portugal.[19] Major ends his discussion thus: "With respect to the documents now produced by Mr. Margry, the sum of the investigation yields a result which, unless further explanation can be given, is unavoidable, that, as all the surrounding evidence is not only not corroborative, but contradictory and condemnatory, an unauthenticated document, with internal indications of not being genuine, and represented by a copy of a copy, which is itself not forthcoming, is worth absolutely nothing."[20]

Although the provenience of the notorious *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé de Galinée,* one of the two documents on which the exploration of the Ohio by La Salle in 1669-1670 is partly based, and the priority of his exploration of the Mississippi to that of Jolliet and Marquette is wholly based, is not quite as worthless as the document referred to by Major, it is almost so; as for the other document on which the exploration of the Ohio is based, there is a statement of its author to the effect that for those years of La Salle's career he had no data at all.

The other champion of this priority is Gabriel Gravier,[21] for whom the vague, suspected documents are more definite, more genuine than they appeared to Margry. And it speaks volumes

---

[18] *Smith College Studies,* VIII, 173.

[19] Richard Henry Major, *The Life of Prince Henry of Portugal,* London, 1868.

[20] Major, *ibid.,* Preface, li.

[21] Gabriel Gravier, *Découvertes et Etablissements de Cavelier de la Salle de Rouen, dans l'Amérique du Nord,* Rouen, 1870; *Cavelier de la Salle de Rouen,* Paris, 1871.

for Gravier's broad-mindedness, when it is remembered that he accepted their contents as apodictic proofs before ever having seen them.[22] Gravier's reasons are not far to seek. Besides being anticlerical, Gravier was *de Rouen,* as was La Salle, and hence civic pride played its part. Margry and Gravier became united by strong bonds of mutual admiration,[23] and thirty years later Paul Chesnel attached himself to their school, contributing little more than volume to the chorus.[24]

On the appearance of the first three volumes of the *Découvertes,* Shea wrote his sharp criticism, "The Bursting of Pierre Margry's La Salle Bubble," in which he called attention to Margry's duplication of documents printed elsewhere, sometimes at greater length, and notably in Broadhead. Winsor tabulated names and arguments lined up for and against the priority of La Salle in the discovery of the Mississippi.[25] The exploration of the Ohio by La Salle was taken for granted. This came into question when American scholars focused their attention on the accounts of Virginia travelers, and when the Ohio legend, invented by Bernou and Renaudot, was thrust upon Parkman by Margry, the American could not defend himself, for his way was barred in that he had access only to copies of materials which it pleased the archivist to give him. Having accepted the legend, Parkman lent his great name unwittingly as proof for it to later historians.[26] "Although many have suspected the accounts of La Salle's discovery of the Ohio, the majority of historians have accepted it on very slender evidence. Mr. Frank E. Melvin of the University of Illinois has finally proved in our opinion, by the use of new evidence, its falsity. His essay on the subject will soon be published.[27] The latest writer concerning this region, Mr. Hanna,[28] is also prepared to reject the tale as a fabrication, and writes that it is 'only a question of time when the evidence will be declared wholly false.' "[29] A little more than a decade after Alvord and Bidgood wrote, De Villiers pointed out that the two

---

[22] *Cavelier de la Salle de Rouen,* 22-23.

[23] *Ibid.,* 5-6.

[24] Paul Chesnel, *Histoire de Cavelier de la Salle,* Paris, 1901.

[25] Winsor, *Narrative . . . ,* V, 245-246.

[26] Clarence Walworth Alvord and Lee Bidgood, *The First Explorations of the Trans-Allegheny Region by the Virginians,* 1650-1674, Cleveland, 1912, 20.

[27] Dr. T. C. Pease of the University of Illinois informed the writer that to his knowledge the essay of Melvin was not published.

[28] Charles A. Hanna, *The Wilderness Trail,* New York, 1911, II, 87 ff.

[29] Alvord and Bidgood, *ibid.,* 24 note 8; cf. C. W. Alvord, *The Illinois Country,* 1673-1818, Springfield, 1920, 78.

documents by means of which the legend was imposed upon the world, were in reality mere modifications of the Galinée account and belonged wholly to imaginative literature.[30]

It is now the purpose of this essay to submit the evidence contained in the two documents upon which the claims are based, that is, the *Mémoire sur le projet du Sieur de la Salle* and the *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé Galinée,* to a critical examination with regard to their authorship and their contents.

The authors of the documents are known. Parkman thought that the first one was written by La Salle, modestly speaking of himself in the third person.[31] De Villiers on the other hand stated that the *Mémoire sur le projet du Sieur da la Salle*[32] was most certainly written by La Salle's "agent," Abbé Bernou.[33] The document printed by Margry is in the hand of Bernou,[34] who, as will appear, wrote many other relations of the journeys of La Salle. The author of the second document[35] is another abbé, Eusèbe Renaudot. The reasons that prompted these two politicians to fabricate these documents are easily found. Renaudot belonged to the Jansenistic faction; he was a friend of Arnauld, the leader of the group of bitter enemies of the Jesuits, and he felt that by imagining one or two La Salle journeys, the priority of a discovery attributed to a Jesuit could be overthrown, and their *Relations* found at fault. Renaudot was not the man to hesitate in inventing such imaginary explorations.[36] It must be stated, however, that neither Renaudot, nor Bernou, nor La Salle, ever made public such a claim; it was necessary to wait more than two centuries before Margry made this "discovery." As for the Ohio, the French Government *asserted* that it had been discovered by La Salle,[37] but not one shred of proof was ever produced during the bitter disputes between the

---

[30] De Villiers, *La découverte du Missouri . . .* , 2-18.

[31] *La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West,* 24, note 3.

[32] Margry, I, 329-336.

[33] *La découverte du Missouri . . .* , 11, cf. C. W. Alvord, *The Illinois Country,* 78.

[34] *Bibliothèque Nationale,* hereinafter quoted as BN, Clairambault, 1016:49-50 v.

[35] *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé de Galinée,* Margry, I, 345-402. The present writer did not see the document in the Archives Nationales, K 1232: n. 1, 111 p. The entry in Surrey's Calendar, under the date [1678, June], states that there are omissions in Margry. Cf. the note in Margry, III, 626, on this document.

[36] To ridicule the *Relations de la Nouvelle-France* as so many fairy tales became later a task of the Recollect Chrestien Leclercq, *Premier etablissement de la Foy,* Chapter XV and ff.

[37] T. C. Pease, *Anglo-French Boundary Disputes in the West,* 1749-1763, Springfield, Illinois, 1936, lix.

courts of France and Britain over the western boundary line of the English provinces in America.

Bernou's aim in this question was to profiteer on La Salle's explorations.[38] He wanted to be La Salle's "agent," if the explorer succeeded, but his paid agent. Bernou was willing to devote himself to the aggrandizement of France. He was, he wrote to Renaudot,[39] passionately zealous for the development of the French colonies, provided there be some consideration, a *certum quid* as he calls it, which in this case was a bishopric in the French West Indies, or in the countries discovered by La Salle. Biographical data on this abbé are very scanty. His name, says De Villiers, is not found in the catalogue of the Bibliothèque Nationale,[40] although he corresponded with many scholars of his time, and collaborated in newspaper work. For a while, according to Margry,[41] he edited the *Gazette de France* during the absence of his friend Renaudot. What is known and set down here is gathered from passing remarks about himself found in his writings. He was born in the "vicinity of the estates of the illustrious House of Nemours."[42] He made the acquaintance of Renaudot about 1671,[43] who thereafter molded Bernou to his own image.[44] In 1683, Bernou went to Rome as unofficial agent,[45] as counsel of the special envoy of the Portuguese government, then in trouble with Spain over Colonia do Sacramento in South America. Bernou's talents for intrigue and politics were being made use of by Portugal.[46] This task was to the liking of the abbé who heartily detested the Spaniards.[47] But in this as in the

---

[38] There are too many statements by Bernou in his letters to Renaudot to admit any other conclusion. "I beg of you," he wrote February 22, 1864, "if M. de la Salle's affairs are successful to have him confirm my commission as his agent. . . . You know, or you ought to know, that all or the majority of men like him have an agent. That of M. de Cussy is M. Apoil, who was the agent of the former governor [of Santo Domingo]. . . . His salary was 500 *écus*. . . . M. de la Salle promised to give me 500 *écus* also, but he has met with many misfortunes. I did not, however, abandon him when he found himself in adverse circumstances, he should not abandon me in prosperity." BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:98 v. This volume contains the letters of Bernou to Renaudot during the latter's sojourn in Rome. Cf. *ibid.*, 54 v., 96-96 v., 108, 158, and Margry, III, 82.

[39] Margry, III, 82.

[40] "La Louisiane, Histoire de son nom . . .," in *Journal de la Société des Américanistes de Paris*, XXI, n. s., 1929, 19.

[41] Margry, III, 629.

[42] BN, Clairambault, 1016:651.

[43] BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:220.

[44] *Ibid.*, 93.

[45] *Ibid.*, 9.

[46] *Ibid.*, 32, 45.

[47] *Ibid.*, 18, 44, etc., BN, Clairambault, 1016:199-205 v., 208-209 v., etc.

case of being La Salle's agent, Bernou wanted his zeal financially rewarded.[48] His enthusiasm for the "cause" of Portugal singularly cooled off when the recompense for his services did not come up to his expectations.[49] There is no doubt that Bernou was a first class diplomatic agent who was able to tell some very unpalatable truths without antagonizing people; he had always in mind that those with whom he disagreed at present might be needed later on to secure his own ends.[50] He was far above the bitter feelings of Renaudot or La Salle. He disapproved the latter's attitude towards the Jesuits, for he thought that the explorer might be greatly helped in his plans by the missionaries in North America,[51] and the abbé himself considered that M(onsieu)r R(obe) N(oire), as he designates the Jesuits in his letters, might be helpful for the success of his "great design,"[52] despite his lack of any penchant for Mr. R. N.[53]

During his sojourn in Rome, he wrote to Renaudot at least once a week. These letters, says Leland, "are exceedingly interesting for the light they throw on various aspects of La Salle's enterprises, and other American matters."[54] Besides, as will appear later, they also throw light on the composition of La Salle's relations, on La Salle's character, on his last expedition, on Bernou's schemes and plans.

Bernou's friend and correspondent, Renaudot, the author of the second document, the *Récit d'un ami de l'abbé Galinée,* on which La Salle's exploration of the Ohio and his priority to the discovery of the Mississippi is based, is better known. Eusèbe Renaudot was born in Paris in 1646. He was the grandson of Theophraste Renaudot, the founder of the *Gazette de France* (1631), the first French newspaper. His classical studies were made at the Jesuit college in Paris, and he joined the Oratorians in 1665, but for a short time. Notwithstanding his title of abbé, he never took major orders. After the death of his father, Eusèbe, and of his uncle, Isaac, he was the editor of the *Gazette de France.* Renaudot became one of the foremost Orientalists of

---

[48] BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:26 v., 38 v., 43, etc.
[49] *Ibid.*, 228 v., 230.
[50] *Ibid.*, 143.
[51] *Ibid.*, 86 v.
[52] *Ibid.*, 143 v., 224.
[53] Margry, III, 80.
[54] Waldo G. Leland, *Guide to Materials for American History in the Libraries and Archives of Paris,* Washington, D. C., 1932, I, 98.

his time, and was elected to the French Academy in 1689. He died in 1720.[55]

The article in Michaud, written by an Orientalist, adds important details concerning Renaudot's literary activities.[56] These details help to understand the composition of the *Récit* printed in Margry. Renaudot's best known book is the *Perpétuité de la Foi,* which aroused the opposition of both Catholics and Protestants. To prove his point, the abbé translated ambiguous expressions to fit in with his own opinions. Later he published a translation of the *Anciennes Relations des Indes et de la Chine.* They are accounts of travel by Arab merchants to South China in the ninth century, and while the narrative is interesting, they did not deserve the confidence Renaudot gave to the information supplied by the merchants with regard to the customs of China.

The author of the article in Michaud continues:

> When he published his translation—from Arabic—the learned theologian had neglected to make known where the manuscript which he published and annotated was to be found. He was satisfied with saying in a vague way that it was in the library of Count de Seignelay, Colbert's son. As a result scholars long doubted the authenticity of these relations, if not of the whole, at least of some of them. Scholars were all the more inclined to doubt of their authenticity when they saw the translator, in the preface and in long notes, made it too evident that he was not sorry to find in these relations information which seemed to demonstrate that the Relations sent by the Jesuits missionaries from and about China were either false or full of gross exaggerations.

The *Récit* was also an occasion to disparage the Jesuit Relations of North America. In 1797, a French scholar discovered the mysterious manuscript. It was found that it had been faithfully edited, but "assertions in the preface and long explanations at the end, inserted with the evident intention to decry the Chinese and to cast doubt on the veracity of the relations of the missionaries or on the scholarship of those who praised these relations, caused the book of Renaudot to be much criticized."

The *Récit* remained buried in the Archives until it was found by Margry who inserted it in the first volume of his compilation. Since it was unpublished, the missionaries of New France were not able to answer it, as those in China were. The answer came from a Jesuit who had spent years in China, and who knew the

---

[55] Louis Moréri, *Le Grand Dictionnaire Historique,* Paris, 1759. The article on Renaudot in the *Nouvelle Biographie Générale,* Paris, 1862, is an abridgment of that in Moréri.

[56] *Biographie Universelle,* Paris, 1824.

language and the customs of the people much better than Renaudot's Arab merchants, and infinitely better than the speculative abbé. Renaudot, a scholar in so far as the languages of the Near East were concerned, was definitely not at home in Far East lore. This answer, complete and thorough, is not only a refutation, it is also a devastating blow at Renaudot's authority.[57]

These, then, are the authors of the two documents, which are both based on the account of Galinée for their details about the Ohio River. The voyage of La Salle found in Renaudot's *Récit,* is a pure invention. The pertinent passages of Galinée's narrative are given below for the sake of comparison, and at the same time to show that La Salle before leaving Montreal, in 1669, knew all that he needed to supply Bernou and Renaudot with details about the course of the Ohio.

It was at this place (Quebec) that M. de Courcelles requested him (Dollier) to unite with M. de la Salle, a brother of M. Cavelier, in order that they might make the journey M. de la Salle had long been premeditating towards a great river, which he understood (by what he thought he had learned from the Indians) had its course towards the west, and at the end of which, after seven or eight months' traveling, these Indians said the land was "cut," that is to say according to their manner of speaking, the river fell into the sea. This river is called in the language of the Iroquois, "Ohio." On it are settled a multitude of tribes, from which as yet no one has been seen here, but so numerous are they that, according to the Indians' report, a single nation will include fifteen or twenty villages. The hope of beaver, but especially of finding by this route the passage into the Vermilion Sea, into which M. de la Salle believed the River Ohio emptied, induced him to undertake this expedition, so as not to leave to another the honor of discovering the passage to the South Sea and thereby the road to China.

M. de Courcelles, the governor of this country, was willing to support this próject in which M. de la Salle showed him some probability by a great number of fine speeches, of which he has no lack. . . .

M. Barthelemy was intended to be a member of the party. . . . Accordingly, towards the end of the month of June, 1669, everybody was preparing in good earnest to set out. M. de la Salle wished to take five canoes and fourteen men, and Messieurs Dollier and Barthelemy three canoes and seven men.

The talk was already of starting as soon as possible, and every one had done his packing, when it occurred to the abbé de Queylus that M. de la Salle might possibly abandon our gentlemen, and that his temper, which was known to be rather volatile, might lead him to quit them at the first whim,

---

[57] *Lettres Edifiantes et curieuses,* Paris, 1781, 183-237. Bernou who had seen the manuscript of Renaudot's book, had called his friend's attention to some errors, cf. BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:230 v.

perhaps when it was most necessary to have some one with a little skill in finding his bearings for the return journey or acquainted with the situation of known countries, in order not to get them into difficulties through imprudence, and besides, it was desirable to have some trustworthy map of the route that was contemplated.

It was from these considerations that the abbé de Queylus permitted me to accompany M. Dollier when I asked his leave. I had already some smattering of mathematics, enough to construct a map in a sort of fashion, but still sufficiently accurate to enable me to find my way back again from any place I might go in the woods and streams of this country. . . .

Our fleet, consisting of seven canoes each with three men, left Montreal on the 6th of July, 1669, under the guidance of Seneca Iroquois, who had come to Montreal as early as the autumn of the year 1668 to do their hunting and trading. These people while here had stayed a long time at M. de la Salle's, and had told him so many marvels of the river Ohio, with which they said they were thoroughly acquainted, that they inflamed in him more than ever the desire to see it. They told him that this river took its rise three days' journey from Seneca, that after a month's travel one came upon the Honniasontkeronons and the Chiouanons, and that, after passing the latter and a great cataract or waterfall that there is in this river, one found the Outagame and the country of the Iskousogos, and finally a country so abundant in roebucks and wild cattle that they were as thick as the woods, and so great a number of tribes that there could be no more.

M. de la Salle reported all these things to M. Dollier . . . (whose) zeal prevented from remarking that M. de la Salle, who said that he understood the Iroquois perfectly and had learned all these things from them through his perfect acquaintance with their language, did not know it at all, and was embarking upon this expedition almost blindly, scarcely knowing where he was going. He had been led to expect that by making some present to the village of the Senecas, he could readily procure slaves of the tribes to which he intended to go, who might serve him as guides.[58]

There is not the slightest reason to doubt any part of the account of the young Sulpitian, who although friendly was not deceived by the *belles paroles* of La Salle.[59] Abbé de Queylus, the Superior of the Sulpitians of Montreal, had also had time to notice the unstable character of La Salle, who might change his mind about the discovery he was so bent upon making and

---

[58] James H. Coyne, translator and editor, "Explorations of the Great Lakes, 1669-1670, by Dollier de Casson and de Brehant de Galinee, Galinee's narrative and map," in Ontario Historical Society, *Papers and Records*, IV, part I, 5-9. Galinée's account, English only, is found in L. P. Kellogg, *Early Narratives of the Northwest*, 1634-1699, New York, 1917, 167-209; Margry, I, 112-166.

[59] Bernou, speaking of La Salle, wrote to Renaudot, November 4, 1684, "Je voic que c'est un grand discoureur, peu sincere, et d'assez mauvaise foy, et je vous avoüe que si je ne savois que de luy ce qu'il nous a débité, j'aurois peine à en rien croire." BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:169. Two weeks later: "Je le (La Salle) connois et je sçais par expérience que dans la

abandon the missionaries when they least expected it.[60] It is clear that this is the first voyage of La Salle, and that his knowledge of Indian languages was not as comprehensive as his admirers supposed.[61]

The expedition reached Sonnontouan, a Seneca village, and during the sojourn there, continues Galinée,

> we had made careful inquiry as to the road we must take to reach the river Ohio, and everybody had told us that in order to get to it from Seneca, it was six days' journey by land of about twelve leagues each. This made us think it was not possible for us to get to it that way, as we could hardly carry anything for so long a journey but the mere necessaries of life—carrying our baggage being out of the question. But at the same time, we were told that in going to Lake Erie by canoe we should have only three days portage to get to that river, much nearer to the tribes we were seeking than we should find it going by Seneca.[62]

As they could not obtain a guide, they left this village, crossed the Niagara below the Falls. They reached Tinawatawa, an Iroquois village on the northern shore of Lake Ontario, September 24. Here they met Jolliet coming from Lake Superior. He told them of the Potawatomi, a numerous Ottawa tribe, and gave them a description of a shorter route to reach these Indians which M. Dollier wished to evangelize.

> Meanwhile M. de la Salle's illness was beginning to take away from him the inclination to push further on, and the desire to see Montreal was beginning to press him. He had not spoken of it to us, but we had clearly perceived it,

so that when the two Sulpitians were making themselves ready to leave for the Potawatomi country by the route Jolliet had indicated to them,

---

necessité il est homme à tout promettre aus gens dont il a besoin pour gagner du tems, et à aller à ses fins sans se mettre beaucoup en peine des suites que pourront avoir ses manquemens de parole." *Ibid.*, 173.

[60] M. de Queylus had more than one reason to apprehend the consequences of La Salle's fickleness, cf. Faillon, *Histoire de la Colonie Française en Canada*, Villemarie, 1866, III, 290. With this opinion of de Queylus, cf. what La Salle's Jesuit superiors formerly thought in this respect, C. de Rochemonteix, *Les Jésuites et la Nouvelle-France au XVIIe siècle*, Paris, 1895-1896, III, 44.

[61] After La Salle's arrival in Canada, "he at once began to study the Indian languages, and with such success that he is said, within two or three years, to have mastered the Iroquois and seven or eight other languages and dialects," Parkman, *La Salle*, 24. Parkman refers here to the *Papiers de Famille;* if the information found in other family papers is as accurate as that found in these, for instance in the papers referred to in the letter of Madeleine Cavelier, Margry, I, 379, there seems little reason to regret their loss.

[62] Coyne, 35-37.

M. de la Salle, seeing us determined to depart in two or three days, in order to proceed to the bank of the river that was to take us to Lake Erie, explained himself to us, and told us that the state of his health no longer permitted him to think of the journey he had undertaken along with us. He begged us to excuse him if he abandoned us to return to Montreal, and added that he could not make up his mind to winter in the woods with his men, where their lack of skill and experience might make them die of starvation.[63]

On September 30, 1669, after M. Dollier had said Mass, the expedition broke into two groups.

We had no trouble in persuading our men to follow us. There was not one at that time who desired to leave us; and it may be said with truth that more joy was remarked in those who were going to expose themselves to a thousand perils than in those who were turning back to a place of safety, although the latter regarded us as people who were going to expose ourselves to death; as indeed they announced as soon as they arrived here (Montreal) and caused a great deal of pain to those who took some interest in our welfare.[64]

Where did La Salle go after he left the Sulpitians on the northern shore of Lake Ontario? For Margry and others he went down the Ohio as far as Louisville,[65] that is, he made with fewer men, minus the companions of Dollier and Galinée and minus those of his own men who returned to Montreal, a journey much more hazardous than the one he could not make up his mind to undertake with the Sulpicians because of the lack of skill and experience of all his men for wintering in the woods; and furthermore, thus at a disadvantage, he made a journey of incomparably greater difficulty than anything he ever attempted afterwards.[66] Naturally, if La Salle had made the journey, if there were proofs that he went down the Ohio, such reasoning would be worth nothing, but there is no proof other than the account of Bernou and that of Renaudot. The next time the explorer was heard of was in the following summer, 1670, when Perrot met "a little below (the rapids) of the Chats, M. de la Salle, who was hunting with five or six Frenchmen and ten or

---

[63] Coyne, 47-49. Lorin, 13, tells his readers that Dollier and Galinée "abandoned" La Salle, and, 14, that the two Sulpitians "laissèrent leur compagnon malade, vers l'extrémité occidentale du Lac Ontario."

[64] Coyne, 49.

[65] Gravier, who never has any difficulty, asserts in *Découvertes,* 38, that La Salle "marcha droit sur l'Ohio."

[66] Charles Whittlesey, "Discovery of the Ohio River, by Robert Cavelier de la Salle, 1669-1670," in *Western Reserve and Northern Ohio Historical Society, Tract 38,* 12.

twelve Iroquois."[67] This portage, situated on the Ottawa River near Arnprior, is more than 700 miles in a straight line from the Louisville rapids. La Salle himself never said he went down the Ohio, or where he spent the winter of 1669 and the Spring of 1670. It was left to Bernou to concoct this voyage more than ten years later. What the explorer did after he left Dollier and Galinée, anybody may guess. He might have gone back to the Iroquois village where the party had received a hearty welcome; he apparently did not go back to Montreal with some of his men; this cannot be deduced from the account of Galinée, who was back in Montreal in June, 1670.[68]

The vague, confused, misleading account of Bernou published by Margry[69] reads as follows:

> Memoir on the project of Sieur de la Salle to discover the West part of North America between New France, Florida and Mexico.
>
> Sieur de la Salle having always felt much inclination for making discoveries and founding colonies which would be advantageous to Religion and useful to France, went to Canada in 1666, and began that same year the La Chine village, situated in the Island of Montreal, far from all French habitations. In the year 1667 and in those following, he made several journeys with much expense, in which he was the first to discover much land south of the Great Lakes, among which the great Ohio River. He followed it to a place where it falls from very high into vast marshes, at the 37th degree of latitude, after having been increased by another River, very large, which comes from the North, and all its waters[70] discharging themselves, according to all appearances into the Gulf of Mexico making him hope[71] to find a new way of communication with the sea, from which New France might some day derive great advantages, as well as from the Great Lakes which occupy a part of North America.

It is clear that this is a version of Galinée's account, with the differences that it is no longer the Iroquois Indians who are speaking of the Ohio, but La Salle and he is made to explore this river to the great fall. A few other incorrect data are added. La Salle did not go to Canada in 1666, but in the Fall of 1667,[72]

---

[67] Jules Tailhan, ed., *Memoire sur les Moeurs, Coustumes et Relligion des Sauvages de l'Amerique Septentrionale,* par Nicolas Perrot, Leipzig and Paris, 1864, 119-120.

[68] Letter of Talon to Colbert, in Margry, I, 80, and *ibid.*, I, 181, the relation of de Courcelles' journey to Lake Ontario.

[69] Margry, I, 329.

[70] The translation is that of Bernou's text which has *et toutes ses eaux,* BN, Clairambault, 1016:49.

[71] Margry's two words "fait-on" do not make sense, Bernou has *et luy font espérer.*

[72] Rochemonteix, III, 51, note 4, says that La Salle is mistaken in saying that he went to Canada in 1666. The Jesuit historian evidently thought that this memoir had been written by La Salle. For the date of

and consequently he got his tract of land no earlier than at the end of 1667 or at the beginning of 1668.[73] The Iroquois came in the Fall of 1668; La Salle did not travel that year, for he was clearing his concession, and he did not travel in 1669, for he was busy preparing to leave with Dollier from the Spring until July.[74] We have the desire for explorations spoken of by Galinée, and the great fall spoken of by the Iroquois. No longitude is given. The latitude is one degree farther north than that observed by Jolliet, whose narrative Bernou possessed, where the Ohio flows in the Mississippi. Bernou thought it would be prudent to stop La Salle one degree north of the point reached by Jolliet and given by the Canadian as the latitude 36 degrees, where the Ohio met the Mississippi. As is known Cairo is on the 37 degree, for Jolliet made a mistake of one degree in his calculations; and the rapids near Louisville, the only falls on the Ohio, are on the 38 degree. The very great river that comes from the north can only be the Wabash and this does not flow into the Ohio above the rapids, but some 130 miles below. The fall of the Ohio is not "great," there is a drop of twenty-seven feet over a course of two and a half miles. There are no marshes. But it is argued that there might have been a flood that year, and, for the French clauses *il la suivit jusques à un endroit où elle tombe de fort haut dans de vastes marais,* an ingenious if somewhat fantastic explanation has been suggested. In order to do away with this bothersome fall, this sentence is translated: 'he followed it to a place where it empties after a long course, into vast marshes.'[75]

This explanation to all appearances was advanced, because

La Salle's arrival in Canada, cf. Faillon, III, 228; Rochemonteix, III, 48; Gilbert J. Garraghan, "Some Newly Discovered Marquette and La Salle Letters," in *Archivum Historicum Societatis Jesu,* IV, 1935, 277; *id.*, "La Salle's Jesuit Days," in MID-AMERICA, XIX, 1937, 98.

[73] Faillon, III, 229, found a document in the *greffe* of Montreal that in the winter of 1668, La Salle granted 200 arpents of pasture land from his own fief to Barthélemy Vinet.

[74] The sale of his property to the Sulpitians is of the beginning of 1669, Faillon, III, 288.

[75] J. P. Dunn, *Indiana, A Redemption from Slavery,* Boston and New York, 1905, 10, note. The philological discussion in this note is not pertinent. To be of any value this explanation should have been supported by a text from the letters of La Salle—or in this case from those of Bernou, since he is the author of the memoir—where "tomber de fort haut" refers to the length of the stream. Indeed, the text in Margry II, 80, has "fort haut," but the full expression is "remonter jusques fort haut," which meant then as it means now "to go far up a stream." The verb "tomber" as in Margry, II, 128, referring to the discharge of a river, and the two words "fort haut" in the expression "remonter jusques fort haut" cannot be combined as in Bernou's text to mean the length of a river.

it was supposed that La Salle had written the memoir, and it is a desperate attempt at reconciling the text with the geography of the country it purports to describe. The explorer, if he had in reality been near the rapids at Louisville, could not have made such a mistake. The memoir is Bernou's; and it is the abbé who interprets the "grand sault ou cheute d'eau" of the Iroquois in Galinée's account by "tomber de fort haut." In 1682, when Bernou sent the memoir[76] to Seignelay, together with the so-called *Relation officielle,* the word Ohio is not even mentioned, and the journey down this river to the great fall at the 37° of latitude has also disappeared. "He (La Salle) was the first to conceive the project of these discoveries, which he mentioned more than fifteen years ago[77] to M. de Courcelles, governor, and to M. Talon, intendant of Canada, who approved it. He then made several journeys in that direction (Mississippi River), among others in 1669, with MM. Dollier and Galinée, priests of the Seminary of St. Sulpice."[78] The conclusiveness of this statement is strengthened when it is remembered that Bernou is here answering an objection made that La Salle was not the first to discover the River Colbert, that is, the Mississippi. All the operations of the explorer are recounted, the building of Fort Frontenac, the construction of the *Griffon,* the discovery of the Sioux country. If La Salle had discovered the Ohio, here was the place where mention of it would certainly have been made. Finally, there is an avowal by Bernou showing that he drew upon his imagination when he composed his account of La Salle's travel

---

[76] This memoir, BN, Clairambault, 1016:190-193, printed in Margry, II, 277-288, in the handwriting of Bernou, cf. Margry, III, 629, was certainly composed by the abbé. The ideas, the style, and certain peculiarities of spelling remove all reasonable doubt. Bernou is also the author of the so-called *Relation officielle,* BN, Clairambault, 1016-85-91 v., which is an abridgment of the relation printed in Margry, I, 435 ff. This, as well as the long relation of La Salle, BN, Clairambault, 1016:92-147, bear all internal marks of being Bernou's work, but these two documents are in the hand of a copyist, the same copyist. For other details, cf. Leland, *Guide,* 172.

[77] Bernou still thought that La Salle went to Canada in 1666. This date the document, 1682.

[78] The *Relation officielle* as printed in Margry, I, 436, reads: "Il (La Salle) communiqua ensuite au Sieur de Courcelles, gouverneur du Canada, le dessein qu'il avoit de travailler à ceste descouverte, et il le trouva si bien fondé qu'il l'encouragea à l'exécuter au plus tost. Le Sieur de la Salle pour prendre des mesures plus justes, fit dievers voyages, tantost avec des François, tantost avec des Sauvages, et mesme avec MM. Dollier et Galinée, prestres du séminaire de Saint-Sulpice, l'année 1669; mais une violente fièvre l'obligea à les quitter à l'entrée." The text in Bernou up to here is the same as that reproduced by Margry, but the abbé has three words after "l'entrée" which change somewhat the text: "mais une violente fièvre l'obligea à les quitter à l'entrée *du lac Erie,*" BN, Clairambault, 1016:85.

down the Ohio in 1669-1670. La Salle was then in France (1684); the abbé wrote to Renaudot: "Give him (La Salle) the relation I wrote, which I left with you. He will be able to use it as an outline (canevas); let him correct it or lengthen it, if this should be easier for him, although I would prefer him to rewrite it not being myself very much satisfied with it, especially with regard to the beginning for which I lacked dates and memoirs."[79]

La Salle himself mentions the Ohio several times, but not as one who had a direct knowledge of that river. In September, 1680, he refers to it as a river *que j'ai trouvée,* as a better means of communication to bring back the products of the Illinois country to Fort Frontenac than by way of the Great Lakes.

> This river, which I call Baudrane, the Iroquois name Ohio, and the Ottawa, Olighin-cipou.[80] . . . This river Baudrane rises behind Oneida, and after a westward course of about 450 leagues, almost always equally large and more than the Seine at Rouen, but much deeper, discharges itself into the River Colbert, twenty to twenty five leagues, South-south-west of the mouth by which the Illinois river flows into the same stream. A *barque* can go up this river very far near to Tsonnontouan.[81]

Margry italicized the words *que j'ai trouvée,* as if La Salle had made the discovery ,whereas La Salle had merely heard about it from the Indians,[82] just as he had heard from the Iroquois of the great falls; the latter have disappeared altogether from this account. He says that this Baudrane-Ohio-Olighin-cipou river can be ascended very far by *barques,* that is, by decked ships like the *Griffon,* as opposed to canoes.

In his letter of August 22, 1682, La Salle speaks of the Maumee as being "called Tiotontaraeton by the Iroquois, . . . —without doubt the passage to go to the Ohio or Olighinsipou, which means in Iroquois and in Otawa, Beautiful River." The route between this Tiotontaraeton and the Ohio, on the other hand, is too long and too difficult, but at one day's journey from the mouth of the Maumee, there is a little lake whence flows a creek which soon becomes a river. After a course of one hun-

---

[79] "Donnez luy ma relation que vous avez qui pourra luy servir de canevas, ou qu'il pourra corriger et augmenter si cela luy est pluscommode, quoyque j'aimerois mieux qu'il la fit de nouveau, n'en estant pas moi mesme beaucoup satisfait, surtout dans le commencemens ou je manquois de dates et de memoires." BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:89.

[80] Margry, II, 141.

[81] Margry, II, 80; cf. *ibid.,* 98.

[82] The distance given, twenty to twenty-five leagues, is less than a third of the actual distance.

dred leagues the river receives the Miami, and finally discharges itself into the Illinois river, "two leagues below the village," and then into the Mississippi. This river without rapids, which flows into the Illinois is the Wabash or the Aramoni (Vermilion).[83] La Salle was evidently speaking from hearsay. He had met a Shawnee chief the year before, who had mentioned a great river (the Wabash) "which flows into the Ohio, and thence into the Mississippi."

It is easy to understand that Bernou was puzzled when he read all this. The abbé wanted La Salle to make a clear distinction between what he himself had seen and what he had heard from the Indians. He wrote to Renaudot to urge La Salle to write a detailed account of his travels from the time the explorer left Fort Frontenac in a canoe after the defeat of the deserters, and to urge La Salle to draw a map, "but I have two things to tell you on this subject. First, it is necessary that he (La Salle) add the true shape of all the lakes, for he told me that Lake Ontario was not as it is represented (on maps) and that it is narrower toward the middle. He must add the course of the rivers and the (direction and lay) of the mountains which he did not see, but according as he will have learned from the Savages or from the French, (such items) as the Aramoni River, the old Ohio River, etc., indicating on the map what he saw and what he heard."[84] The second thing Bernou is asking for, is that a copy of the map be sent to him in Rome.

The other passages where La Salle speaks of the Ohio will be treated later. The two notices by Tonty[85] and by Nicholas de la Salle[86] of the Ohio River in their account of the journey down to the mouth of the Mississippi are negative arguments corroborating the view that La Salle never went down the Ohio either in 1669-1670, or at any other time.

JEAN DELANGLEZ

(To be continued)

---

[83] Margry, II, 243. This autograph letter of La Salle has been tampered with by Bernou; cf. Leland, *Guide*, 172; the changes come after the passage quoted in the text.

[84] "Mais j'ay deux choses à vous dire sur ce sujet. La premiere qu'il est necessaire qu'il y joigne la figure veritable de tous les lacs telle qu'elle est, car il m'a dit que le lac Ontario n'estoit pas fait comme on le representoit, et qu'il se retrecissait vers le milieu, qu'il ajoute le cours des rivières et des montagnes qu'il n'aura pas vües selon ce qu'il en aura appris des sauvages ou des françois comme la rivière Aramoni l'anciene rivière Ohio &c, marquant sur la carte ce qu'il a veu et ce qu'il a oüy." BN, Mss. fr. n. a., 7497:89 v.

[85] Margry, I, 596.

[86] Margry, I, 550.

Notes and Comment

THE EXPULSION OF THE JESUITS FROM BRAZIL

A Latin manuscript narrating the expulsion of the Jesuits from Brazil in 1759 was published last year under the auspices of the Academia Brasileira de Letras. It was found by a Brazilian Jesuit in the Royal Library of Brussels. Its author is Father José Caeiro, a Portuguese Jesuit, who wrote also a history of the expulsion of the Society of Jesus from Portugal. He was exiled from Portugal to Italy, where his manuscript was composed apparently in 1777-1778. The Academia published the Latin text and on the opposite pages a Portuguese translation, and entitled the work: *Os Jesuitas do Brazil e da India na perseguição do Marquês de Pombal.* While Caeiro was never in Brazil or in India, and while he received his information from Jesuits of these two colonies exiled with him in Italy, his authority is none the less unimpeachable, for he gathered, collated, and checked the testimony of eyewitnesses of the events with the skill of a trained historical scholar. Whenever fresh information reached him, he amplified or corrected earlier statements. He analyzed documents at his disposal, such as proclamations and letters, and interpreted them in a singularly accurate way, as the modern reader who compares the texts with his interpretations will testify.

This publication was very much needed. There is no work that gives a detailed picture of the expulsion of the Jesuits from Brazil, an event which has been likened by historians to an Al Kasr al Kebir. The information found in A. Weld, *The Supression of the Society of Jesus in the Portuguese Dominions* is derived from the *Compendio Istorico,* published at Nice, in 1791, which, in turn, is based on the *Mémoires du Marquis de Pombal,* 1784, and on the *Anecdotes du Ministère de Sébastien Joseph Carvalho,* 1783. These works were also used by Southey in his *History of Brazil,* but the Englishman rounded up his account with details he found in Accioli, *Memorias historicas e politicas da Bahia,* in Ayres de Casal *Corographia Brazilica,* and in the *Collecção dos Breves Pontificios e Leys Regias.* The small book of Hafkmeyer, *A Suppresão da Companhia de Jesus,* is inadequate; even the more pretentious work of J. Lúcio de Azevedo, *Os Jesuitas no Grão Pará,* treats rather summarily of the expulsion of the Jesuits from that province of Brazil. The two volumes of Father Madureira, *A liberdade dos Indios, a Companhia de Jesus, a sua pedagogia e seus resultados,* treat extensively of the educational phase of the labors of the Jesuits in Brazil.

First-hand information, though scanty, is found in the *Historia Persecutionis Societatis Jesu,* by Father Anselm Eckart, published in von Murr, *Journal zur Kunstgeschichte und allgemein Litteratur,* 1779, as well as in his *Zusätze zu Pedro Cudena's Beschreibung der Länder von Brasilien,* and a rather complete picture of the expulsion could be obtained by a judicious use of the documents published in Mello Moraes, *Corographia,* in the *Annaes da Bibliotheca Nacional do Rio de Janeiro,* and in the venerable, nearly a century old *Revista do Instituto historico e geographico brasileiro.* Still, the manuscript of Father Caeiro gives details not found in any of these

books, but, and this considering the time when it was written is to be expected, there is little about the aftermath, namely what became of the *aldêas* of Indians after the departure of the Jesuits. These *aldêas* were in the true sense "reductions," as prosperous as the world famous 30 *doctrinas* of Paraguay. Twenty years after the expulsion these Indians villages had nearly all disappeared. It is this débâcle which can truly be compared with that of Al Kasr al Kebir.

Bernard Moses wrote that the expulsion of the Jesuits from Chili in 1767 set back the progress of education in that country fifty years. This would be a conservative estimate if applied to Brazil, as appears from a reading of Henderson's *History of Brazil.*

As is to be expected, Pombal's deeds loom large in Father Caeiro's manuscript. The great Marquis, as he was called by a certain school of "liberal" anticlerical historians, was rather a small man. For a long time, it was nothing short of heresy even to question his statesmanship, or to express the doubt that his rule might not have been beneficial to Portugal and its dominions. That time is passed. Schoell and Crétineau-Joly began to examine reasons for the columns of incense burned to Pombal, and Duhr and Hamel de Breuil finished the examination, as well as the legend of the greatness of Pombal. The latter two authors studied the diplomatic correspondence of the Austrian ambassadors at the Court of Lisbon, all great friends of Pombal, and the "achievements" of the great Marquis consisted in disorder, inefficiency, graft in every department, in the army, in education, in commerce and in foreign affairs. Nor, aside from the consequences of the expulsion of the Jesuits, was Pombal's rule beneficial to Brazil, as has been shown beyond reasonable doubt in the study of J. Lûcio de Azevedo entitled *Politica de Pombal em relação ao Brasil.*

Various causes of Pombal's hatred of the Jesuits have been advanced by historians, but the evidence they have brought forward to prove their theories has, thus far, been inconclusive. Father Caeiro has still another theory, and time will tell whether it will be confirmed by independent evidence. Whatever else Pombal was, he was a great publicity man. Having determined to destroy the Jesuits, his first task was to ruin them in the opinion of the world. He literally flooded Europe with tracts, pamphlets and lampoons, the most notorious of which are the *Relação abreviada* and the *Deducção chronologica.* Most of what is found in other "original" productions of the period and after, is derived from these two lampoons. In Lisbon and in Rome, a score of religious, priests, laymen, for a few *cruzados,* undertook to convince the world that the Jesuits in Brazil were engaged in lucrative, world-wide trade, and that they were fabulously wealthy. How successful Pombal's army of propagandists was may be judged from the fact that today non-critical historians are merely repeating what is found in the *Relação* and in the *Deducção,* in spite of the publication of the account books and of the inventories of the Jesuit houses where information to the contrary is available.

Father Caeiro deals at length with the subserviency of the ecclesiastical authorities to what they were told were the wishes of the king. A general *volte face* took place, the explanation of which belongs to the psychologist rather than to the historian. In Brazil as in Portugal, there is one exception; the Archbishop of Bahia, Botelho de Mattos, refused to fall in with the

plans of Pombal, and to condemn the Jesuits unless their guilt was proved by witnesses. Four score of prominent citizens of Bahia were examined under oath by the Archbishop, and not one accused the Jesuits of trade. When this evidence was sent to Portugal, the Archbishop was summarily dismissed; and as a favor to his advanced age, instead of being recalled to Portugal and given a taste of Pombal's prisons, he was allowed to spend his remaining days, utterly destitute except for meagre alms, in a hut a few miles outside of Bahia. The Bishop of Rio de Janeiro wrote to Pombal that he would see that no such testimony would be given in his diocese. It wasn't. What measures were taken by Miguel de Bulhoes, and what reward this Bishop of Pará received for his zeal, is known to all.

Among the civil officials, Francisco Xavier de Mendonça Furtado, Pombal's brother, is naturally prominent. The writings of Eckart and of Azevedo had already made known the part played by the Governor of Maranhao in the expulsion of the Jesuits from that province, but new details are added by Father Caeiro, who also gives the traditional story about the disgrace of Mascarenhas. This enigmatic episode of Brasilian history has been treated at length in two articles published in the *Revista do Instituto*. The first in date is by Luiz Antonio Ferreira Gualberto, *Prisoes clandestinas*. This author, using the occasion for many fine speeches, gives also as the cause of the imprisonment of Mascarenhas the favor shown to the Jesuits, whom he had been sent to expel. In the second article, Azevedo proves, in our opinion, that the Jesuits had nothing to do with the disgrace of Mascarenhas. This official had been too friendly toward the officers of a French squadron in the port of Bahia. Pombal himself, after his fall from power, when asked by the Queen the reason for the seventeen years of imprisonment of Mascarenhas, answered that it was because he had shown favor to the French to the detriment of the English, then the allies of Portugal.

These few lines give only a very inadequate idea of the information contained in the five hundred pages of this book, three hundred of which deal with Brazil. The fluent Portuguese of the translation should make it accessible to a greater number of readers than if it had been published only in its nervous, compact original Latin. It will find its place next to that of Father Watrin on the expulsion of the Jesuits from Louisiana in 1763, of Father Ducrue, on that of Lower California in 1767, of Father Strzkianowski, still unpublished, on the expulsion of the Jesuits from the Tarahumara mission.—J. D.

MORE ABOUT POINT DU SAIBLE

The article "Jean Baptiste Point du Saible, the First Chicagoan," published in the April number of this review, brought forth considerable comment from local sources. Some readers indicated a great interest in the subject to which Reverend Thomas A. Meehan had turned his pen, others were asking more information about the capable Negro who first established a home within the limits of the present Chicago. Very fortunately there was one who could give information regarding the activities of Point du Saible before and after his residence in this vicinity, and it is a pleasure to supply the added data at this time and to thank Ernest E. East for the supplement.

Mr. East has been employed these years as a journalist for *The Peoria Journal-Transcript* in Peoria, Illinois. He has, moreover, long been interested in the career of Point du Saible, particularly in relation to the early history of Peoria, and is at present president of the Peoria Historical Society. In the course of his persistent and as yet unfinished search for materials pertaining to the life of the earlier townsman of Old Peoria, Mr. East quite naturally became concerned about the origin and death of Du Saible. He is still in quest of the ancestry and place of birth of his subject, but he was successful in finding the time and place of his demise. This latter point was covered by Mr. East in an article published in *The Peoria Journal-Transcript,* Sunday, August 5, 1934, and sent recently to MID-AMERICA. In this article, which is followed by a table of chronological events in the life of Du Saible, the writer not only did away with an old and widely published story that Point had died in Peoria, but also brought out the fact that the man who came to be Chicago's first citizen in 1779 had been a resident of Peoria for the six preceding years.

In order to make certain of the place of death of Du Saible, Mr. East wrote to Reverend William B. Sommerhauser, S. J., one of the fathers in charge of the Jesuit church of St. Charles Borromeo in St. Charles, Missouri, and he received the following reply:

It affords me the greatest pleasure to be able, after much research, to send you the information anent the person asked about in your missive of the 7th inst.

You will be interested to hear a brief reference to the labors which finally led to the discovery of your man. But I will first give you the entry in our parish archives. I shall give you the original in French, and for the event you may not be conversant with that tongue, I will translate it for your benefit.

In Vol. 2 of our burial records, extending from 1807 to 1824, on page 44, the following entry is found: "Le vingt-neuf aout 1818—a ete inhume dans le cemitiere de cette paroisse de S. Charles, Jean Bte. Point Sable negre mort le 28—de ce meme mois sans les secours de l' Eglise. (Signed) Aequaroni Pretre." Translated: "On the 29 of August 1818, was buried in the cemetery of this parish of St. Charles, John Baptist Point du Sable, a mulatto (sic), who died on the 28th of this same month without the last sacraments of the Church. (Signed) Aequaroni, parish priest."

This is evidently the man you are looking for. Let me remark: our earliest and very precious parish documents begin with 1782. Baptismal, marriage, and burial records begin with 1782. . . . Our first book of burials reaches from 1792 to 1807. The second, as stated above, from 1807 to 1824. . . ."

This finding and that of Mr. East extends our knowledge of the life of Point du Saible beyond and before the time of his stay in Chicago, 1779-1800. In 1773 he bought a house and land from Jean Baptiste Maillet at Old Peorias Fort, and in 1778 married an Indian woman named Catherine at Cahokia. The writer visited the archive at St. Charles, indicated above, and he feels that the word *negre* should mean Negro and not mulatto. On the point of the spelling of the name there is controversy, for it is found as Point Sable, Poinstable, Sabre, Sabes, Point au Sable, de Sable, de Saible, according to Mr. East. There are five references to Point Sable which were found by Mr. East in the Draper Collection, Historical Society of Wisconsin, and around these Mr. East intends to write an article. *Draper's Notes* incorporate the remarks of people who traveled in the Mississippi Valley,

and several observations give phrases picturing the personal appearance of Chicago's first citizen. He is referred to as "a large sized man," "about six feet," and before the war of 1812 "sixty years old or more, quite grey and venerable in appearance—finely formed—a very pleasant countenance—was not degraded."

GUIDES AND HELPS FOR THE HISTORIAN

The Newberry Library, Chicago, presented *A Check List of Manuscripts in the Edward E. Ayer Collection* compiled by Dr. Ruth Lapham Butler. There are listed 1769 manuscripts, and there is a promise of an analytic catalogue and calendar of these for library use. This publication is another notable favor to students of history added to the long list of services of the librarians and trustees of the Newberry Library. The printing, done by The Lakeside Press, is as excellent as it is artistic. The index takes 72 pages, making a total of 295 pages for the volume. The writer will testify to the great amount of painstaking work on the part of Dr. Butler and her assistants that preceded the publication of this very helpful volume. Now that the treasures of the Ayer Collection are revealed it is hoped that student interests in the fine documents will be quickened.

The Pacific Northwest Quarterly for April, 1937, in its section of Notes and Documents contains a 30-page "Survey of Seattle Church Archives," edited by Mary Avery. This survey for Seattle was undertaken as a part of a Federal WPA project, which in time will amount to an inventory of all of the existing documents, not only in the other cities of the State of Washington but also of all other states. The national project is under the direction of Dr. Luther H. Evans. The survey will include inspection and tabulation of all archival materials in statehouses, courthouses, city and county buildings, private collections, and churches. The work of Mary Avery deals only with the statement of all of the records extant in the churches of all denominations of Seattle and this is to be amplified by details and the publication of a guide to the churches and their materials in the State of Washington. Surely this is a notable step in the right direction and one that should be given every encouragement by local churchmen because of the much needed and invaluable guide to source materials which will one day be produced. At a conference held in Chicago, February 26-27, attended by executives of historical agencies (Midwest Historical Conference), Mr. Evans addressed the meeting on "The Historical Records Survey."

The Catholic Historical Review for April, 1937, published three more of the papers read at the meeting of the American Catholic Historical Association in Providence, Rhode Island, last December by Fathers James A. Magner, Thomas F. Cullen, and John A. Ryan. In the Miscellany, Monsignor Peter Guilday's report is noteworthy by reason of the fact that he presents a survey of the surveys heretofore made regarding the contributions of Catholics to Catholic historical literature in the United States. It is seen that there have been presented many partial compilations of such works, and furthermore, that many publications by the Catholic laity lie buried in historical magazines, newspapers, and pamphlets. Monsignor Guilday then offers his survey, limiting his list to the outstanding publications of the laity.

The Historical Bulletin rendered a very fine service to its readers and to students by organizing and publishing an excellent index of its first fifteen volumes in the May, 1937, number.

The Hispanic American Historical Review, February, 1937, published the sixth supplement to the *Hispanic American Bibliographies* (1922). Cecil K. Jones, compiler of the list and supplements, prefaces his last contribution with a short but valuable summary of the guides and bibliographies that have appeared during the past few years pertaining to Hispanic-America.

The number of compilers of bibliographical guides to doctoral dissertations and theses being produced in the universities of this country is lengthening. No less than four lists have appeared within the last year, and each of these, amplifying the annual lists of the Carnegie Institution of Washington and *The Canadian Historical Review,* fulfills its general or particular purpose of keeping scholars informed about what research is in progress and what dissertational work has been finished. Many unpublished theses and dissertations housed and hidden in various university libraries thus have at least a marker and are indicated as existing, and at the same time duplication of effort on the part of students of some particular field is avoidable.

Bibliografía Missionaria, Ann III: 1936, was published at the end of March of the present year and consists of 108 pages of books and articles on Catholic missionary subjects published during 1936, although a number of works not mentioned in the two previous numbers of this guide, that is for 1934 and 1935, are included by the compilers, Fathers Rommerskirchen and Dindinger, O. M. I.

In 1934, Mary Alden Walker published *The Beginnings of Printing in the State of Indiana.* Recently, Douglas C. McMurtrie compiled a supplement to this under the title *Indiana Imprints 1804-1849,* which has been printed as Volume II, Number 5, of the Indiana Historical Society Publications. This new compilation adds considerably to the former (86 pages), and amplifies the list of printers in the State in the Introductory Note.

BOOKS ABOUT FOUNDRESSES

Two books have appeared recently, which because of their historical, educational, and social significance, and because they record the life work of two notable religious women, deserve special mention and recommendation. *Journals and Letters of Mother Theodore Guérin,* foundress of the Sisters of Providence of Saint Mary-of-the-Woods, Indiana, were edited and annotated by Sister Mary Theodosia Mug. An excellent survey of the life of Mother Guérin in 28 pages precedes the 452 pages of documentary materials. The journals and letters over and above revealing the splendid spiritual and educational ideals and the self-sacrifice of this woman who began almost one hundred years of educational activities of the Sisters of Providence in America, contain a great amount of historical data that is valuable to the historian. The documents cover the period 1840 to 1856.

Life and Work of Mother Benedicta Bauer was written by Sister Mary Hortense Kohler, O. P. (published by Bruce, 1937), in commemoration of the seventy-five years of existence of the Dominican Sisters in the Middle

West. The story of the early life and European environment of the religious lady who came to Racine, Wisconsin, as a builder and organizer of the educational system of the Dominican Sisters, is told in a non-critical and even reverential way. The first chapters contain background of the foundation of the Dominicans in Europe, and the last portion is devoted to the work of the successors of Mother Bauer. Important at the end is a bibliography indicating a great amount of archival materials pertaining to the Order. It is good to know such publications as these are being undertaken, for too long have the lives and deeds of noted Catholic educators and educational groups remained hidden from pupils who have grown to remember their early teachers with gratitude.

MARQUETTE COMMEMORATIONS

A number of official proclamations and commemorative programs marked the three-hundredth anniversary, June 1, 1937, of the birth of Father Marquette. A Joint Resolution was passed in the Senate of the United States authorizing the President to proclaim the tercentenary, and on May 27 President Roosevelt issued the proclamation directing "all Government officials to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on the first day of June 1937, and I invite all people of the United States to observe that day and the anniversary year in schools, churches, and other suitable places with appropriate ceremonies. . . ." Proclamations similar to that of the Executive were made by other governors and by the mayors of some cities. Governor Horner proclaimed the day "Marquette Day" in accordance with the resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, and Mayor Kelly of Chicago did likewise for Chicago, connecting the celebration with that of the Charter Jubilee of his city.

It is not known to what extent proclamations of the above nature were published to the nation, but suitable historic ceremonies were conducted in the nation's Capital and locally. In Washington they were held officially before Marquette's statue in Statuary Hall with prelates and governmental persons in attendance. Chicagoans were made aware of the occasion by a service in the Cathedral and commemorative addresses at the Michigan Avenue bridge attended by members of the consular corps and civic officers. Just outside Chicago at Summit an elaborate program was carried through before several thousands of people. Notable among the Wisconsin celebrations were those at Prairie du Chien and at Milwaukee, where under the sponsorship of Marquette University, academic functions were combined with the religious and civic. Ludington, Michigan, paid its tribute to the memory of missionary and explorer at the site of his death. The *Bulletin of the Chicago Historical Society* for March, 1937, as well as the newspapers of Chicago carried historical accounts of Marquette. The events taking place at Laon, France, were announced in *Etudes* for April 20, 1937, in the article "Troisième Centenaire du P. Marquette."

Book Reviews

A History of Chicago: Vol. I, *The Beginning of a City, 1673-1848.* By Bessie Louise Pierce, The University of Chicago. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, 1937. pp. xvii+455+xxxi. $5.00.

This impressive volume is the first of a series of four which are planned to cover the history of Chicago in all its range in scholarly and thoroughgoing fashion. The work so planned, it is pointed out in the Foreword of the initial volume, is not one of merely local interest or significance. As conceived by its author and by the Social Science Research Council of the University of Chicago, who projected the work, it is "an interpretation of the rise and development of the most modern of great modern cities, a task which involves, however, not only the history of a single urban community, but an interpretation of a cross section of a century of the history of America, particularly that of the Middle Empire."

The entire Chicago scene for the period 1673-1848 in all its aspects, social, religious, economic, industrial, political and cultural, is here set before the reader with imposing multiplicity of detail. But, for all the rich profusion of the trees, one is made to see clearly the woods, in this instance one of the most amazing patterns of big-scale and highly complicated urban life anywhere on record. On its research and technical sides the work deserves every commendation. Practically all extant sources of information, published and unpublished, primary and secondary, have been exploited, local newspapers being especially tapped for masses of pertinent illuminating data. Letters and other manuscript material in mid-western depositories, especially the Chicago Historical and Newberry libraries, have also been put to account, the result being recurrent vivid touches in the narrative and a general air of actuality which comes of resting one's reconstruction of past realities on original first-hand material. All in all, Miss Pierce's work, with its far-reaching basis of research, its precise and accurate documentation and considered interpretations, meets in a high degree the conventional demands of history-writing of the scholarly, scientific type. It easily takes rank as the most authoritative treatment of the subject now available to the public.

One or other shortcoming may be pointed out. Despite obvious merits, the book is not altogether free from inadequacies of treatment. What may be called the French period of Chicago history, 1673-1763, is despatched in too summary fashion. The reviewer does not share the author's viewpoint (Preface, p. xvi) that the availability of certain published studies of this period is warrant for her slighting it and its intriguing problems. French Chicago is still a topic to challenge the researcher and no major history of the great metropolis quite measures up to its task without giving it treatment proportionate to its interest, if not importance. Certain statements in this section of the volume call for comment. "During this period in the history of New France, there took place a conflict between the Jesuits and the temporal power as to dominance in this region" (p. 8, note 21). The statement is misleading, suggesting as it does a conflict over political

or economic control, a thing not vouched for in any known reliable source. "Pinet had started the Guardian Angel [Mission] after a quarrel with Cadillac" (p. 10, note 30). Pinet had incurred the anger of the irascible Cadillac at Michilimackinac by his open stand against the liquor-trade with the Indians, permitted by the latter. That he left his mission at Michilimackinac in consequence of his differences with Cadillac, as suggested by the above-cited words, is a statement for which there is no evidence in the primary documents. "Angered both by Pinet and the Edict of 1696, which left the Mississippi Valley largely under the influence of the Jesuits, Frontenac closed the Mission [of the Guardian Angel] etc." (*ibid.*). That Frontenac closed the Mission is attested by the *Jesuit Relations;* that he did so for the reasons alleged above cannot be gathered from that or any other known contemporary source the reviewer is aware of. Further, as at the period in question there were only four or five Jesuits in the entire Mississippi Valley, it is not easy to see just what particular influence they were in a position to exercise in that region.

It is regrettable that in the author's treatment of the Indian treaty of 1833 and of the first organization of municipal government in Chicago, no account has been taken of the contribution made to these important topics by James Ryan Haydon in his *Chicago's True Founder: Thomas J. Owen* (Chicago, 1934). Owen was one of the federal commissioners who negotiated the treaty mentioned and, as president of the first local board of town trustees (1833), was virtually Chicago's first mayor. His political activities extending over many years were largely directed to securing recognition for the mouth of the Chicago River as the destined locale of a future promising city. His correspondence in the Indian Office, Washington, which Haydon was the first student to utilize, is capital source-material for Chicago beginninga. And yet, in the history under review Owen's name does not even occur in the text, but only in footnotes, three in number, and in these it is merely mentioned. Mr. Haydon's manner is at times unduly contentious and his interpretations may be open to question; but in any case, he has assembled a body of authentic factual data from the Washington archives which cannot be slighted in any adequate history of Chicago. His book, it may be said here, was sponsored by the recently deceased generous patron of historical scholars and scholarship, Otto L. Schmidt, of Chicago. Unfortunately, Mr. Schmidt's death as also Mr. Haydon's occurred just about the time the latter's book came from the press, with the result, it would appear, that no review copies of it were distributed nor was any other effort made to give it publicity. This circumstance, the reviewer takes it, accounts for its absence from the sources utilized in the preparation of the present work.

A few orthograprical slips occurs. Thus, Hailandières for Hailandière (p. 238); Tamerois for Tamarois (p. 10, note 30); Lefevere for Lefevre (index, p. xvii). Though the forms adopted for Indian tribal names apparently follow the style of the United States Bureau of Ethnology, "Pottawattomie" occurs uniformly for "Potawatomi." Fort Crevecoeur was situated, not on the present site of Peoria (p. 8), but across the Illinois River from that city in Tazewell County where a marker erected under the auspices of the Illinois Historical Society indicates the true site.

The topic of pioneer Catholicism in Chicago, it is pertinent to note, is

handled by Miss Pierce with understanding and satisfying accuracy of detail.

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN

Loyola University, Chicago

A History of Ireland. By Edmund Curtis. New York, Van Nostrand Co., 1937. pp. xi+392.

Professor Curtis of the University of Dublin and of the Trinity school of thought has undertaken in this work a large and dangerous task and according to his purpose has accomplished it rather remarkably well. With a background of thirty years of study in Irish history and special scholarly research in the medieval period and twenty years of teaching in the general field, he was able to assume a commendable initiative in his attempt to survey the story of Ireland from an objective viewpoint and in the light of the past forty years of productions by scholars in particular fields. The author was well aware of the shoals upon which he might steer to a crash, and probably so has done in the opinion of one or other of the religious, political, national, racial, local, or family partisans. But he was likewise aware that people interested in Irish progress through the ages, yet outside the swirl of feelings, impacts, and struggle, were desirous of a unified presentation in more compact form and with a more reasonable proportionment of space to the social, cultural, and economic phases. Some may take umbrage even with this purpose, in view of the general histories of Ireland that have appeared in recent times. Others may resent the use of the possessive "our" in relation to the country, "our religious differences," "our Scandinavian invaders," "our missionaries," and stamp the work as purposefully nationalistic, nativistic, or anti-English in bias. Still, the contention remains that this is a readable survey, useful as a text to the student, capable of expansion and correction in controversial affairs, and presented with an evident effort at fairness and good-will.

In the distribution of his matter the author assigns relatively small space to the earlier pagan period and in conclusion merely surveys the past hundred years, devoting the last chapter to the years 1891-1922. This conservative attitude permits the body of the book to cover the periods of development between 800 A. D. and 1800 in considerable detail. The domain of history is entered with the arrival of St. Patrick, after which the periodizing begins with the building up of the "golden age" when Ireland was a "unity of civilization and law." Invasion, disruption, conquest, and agression follow, and opposing ever is a people struggling toward ideals of a unified culture, polity, economy, and worship. The book is textual, in that there is no citation of authority and only a brief reading list at the end.

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago

Rapport de l'Archiviste de la Province de Quebec pour 1935-1936. By Pierre-Georges Roy. Quebec, 1936. pp. viii+455.

These *Rapports* have long been known for their excellence, which comes from the thoroughgoing care of the archivist and the importance of the materials published. This volume contains the first census of New France,

the conclusion of the inventory of the correspondence of Mgr Bernard Claude Panet, Archbishop of Quebec, and the first installment of the letters and memoirs of the abbé de l'Isle Dieu, 1743-1753.

The census made under Talon in 1666, at the end of what has been called the heroic period, is to the Canadians their "book of nobility," and this dry nomenclature is, as Sir Thomas Chapais wrote, "full of charm and poetry for those Canadians who are attached to their history and their national traditions." The second item is more than a mere calendar, it is a detailed analysis of the correspondence of the Archbishop of Quebec with priests and prominent ecclesiastics of his time.

The letters and memoirs of the abbé de l'Isle Dieu are one of the most important sources for the ecclesiastical history of the Mississippi Valley for the period they cover. Until 1731, the *Correspondance générale, Louisiane,* in the Archives of the Colonies, Paris, supplies the documentary evidence for a knowledge of ecclesiastical affairs; after this date, until the period covered by the letters of l'Isle Dieu, the reference found in the archives of Paris to the missionary life in Louisiana are few. Not many men did more for the Church in Canada and in Louisiana, then under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Quebec, than this abbé. His work was one of unselfish devotedness, he never asked for any reward either from the Bishops of Quebec or from the French government. At the age of 88, he was given a pension "as a token of His Majesty's satisfaction for his zeal and the services he had rendered to the Church and to the State," but the abbé had not asked for it. Pierre de la Rue had a benefice in France, the abbey of l'Isle Dieu—*Sanctae Mariae ab Insula Dei*—near Rouen, whence his title. For more than forty years, 1734-1776, he was the "agent" of the Bishops of Quebec in Paris. This state of affairs is not as strange as it appears at first. Canada and Louisiana were far away in those days. It was necessary for the Bishops of Quebec to have in Paris a man *au courant,* who had at heart the interests of their immense diocese, who would deal personally with the government officials. L'Isle Dieu was not an absentee vicar-general; he was not supposed to be in New France, as was the case of Bishop de Mornay, who sent his portrait to the Chapter of the Cathedral of Quebec to supply for his absence, and who later resigned rather than go to his see. As has been said it was providential that the vicar-general in France was l'Isle Dieu. The aspersions cast on the character of this ecclesiastic are not only unfair, but they are maligning insinuations made in an effort to defend rebellious ecclesiastical adventurers whom l'Isle Dieu had been commissioned to keep out of Canada and Louisiana. Surely, no one can find fault with the Bishops of Quebec for not wanting in their diocese subjects who were sent thither because they were unruly in the mother country. As for the truthfulness of l'Isle Dieu, if one takes the trouble to check his statements on independent evidence, it becomes clear, beyond reasonable doubt, that th abbé's veracity is unimpeachable, and this is more than can be said of some of his adversaries. The same is true of l'Isle Dieu's impartiality.

In this volume the correspondence reaches 1753. It is hoped that the remainder of the letters will be printed in the next *rapport.* It was the privilege of this reviewer several years ago to copy and study these letters in the Archbishop's Palace, Quebec, and it is a pleasure to note the accuracy with which the text is edited. There seems to be a slight error regarding

the addressee of one of these letters. Shouldn't that of February 2, 1746, page 277, be addressed to Maurepas?

JEAN DELANGLEZ

Loyola University, Chicago

A History of Catholic Education in the United States. By Very Rev. J. A. Burns, C. S. C., Ph. D., and Bernard J. Kohlbrenner, M. A. New York, Benziger Brothers, 1937. pp. xi+295. $3.20.

This history of Catholic education in the United States is published as a textbook. As such it is equipped with a fair amount of pedagogical paraphernalia in the way of "Questions and Exercises," "Topics for Investigation," and "Selected Readings." The value of these to the student, and to his teacher as well, is sufficiently vouched for by the reputation of the authors. But they should not frighten away the reader who is not interested in the classroom. The fact that the book is meant to be studied should rather be a guaranty of its objective factual character.

The history of Catholic education is, of course, something more than the mere record of an expanding school system. The marvelous story of the struggle from small beginnings against discouraging odds to the relatively flourishing conditions of today possesses an intrinsic interest even in the bald form of mere statistics. But it also affords an insight into the vitality of a section of the Church that was redressing the balance of a decadent Europe. Moreover, it throws much light upon the economic, social and cultural changes in American life. Members of a Church which has weathered successive storms of persecution following upon lulls of indifference will find in this story an incentive to carry the burden of double taxation which has been the high price of a fruitful existence. They may feel, without malice, a certain satisfaction in the fact that the Catholic school, so often attacked as un-American, is truer to the best American traditions than is its pampered rival, the public school. Public sentiment and mob psychology may make the going rough, as it has done in the past, but the school system built on so much voluntary sacrifice is fairly secure against any argument that can be drawn from reason, the best American tradition or the Constitution.

The authors quite appropriately do some philosophizing on the respective rôles of parent, state and church in the education of the child. They treat with ample detail the various attempts to obtain state subsidies for private schools. They also show, historically, the part played by the hierarchy, the parish priests and the teaching communities.

This revised and enlarged edition of an older work by the Very Reverend James A. Burns is, as the author will readily admit, not altogether flawless. We are not quibbling about nonessentials when we point out that the reader may be irritated and the credit of the author lessened by inaccuracies in dates. The Mexican War did not start in 1845, nor the Civil War in 1860; it may be a mere transposition of terms and a slip or two on the part of the printer that "established" Montreal in 1534 and Quebec in 1542! As frequently happens in books of this kind, the long sweep through the historical background is the least satisfactory part of the narrative.

The book will have in all probability a wide sale. And the author will very likely receive not a few protests. Jealous teaching communities will

feel, reasonably or unreasonably, that their achievements have been slighted. The Religious of the Sacred Heart, for example, may resent being listed in the index as a sort of subtitle under the Brothers of the Sacred Heart! Against his more formidable critics the author can point to the regrettable lack of available materials. He has, in fact, requisitioned an array of doctoral dissertations, still in manuscript, in addition to pertinent printed monographs. We feel that he can still write a better book. Meanwhile this text will serve its purpose.

R. CORRIGAN

St. Louis University

The Federal Union. A History of the United States to 1865. By John D. Hicks. Chicago, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1937. pp. xviii+734. $3.50.

The Federal Union purports to be a textbook for the survey of United States history through the Civil War. Texts are not often held in high honor among professors as they are in the eyes of students and registrars and office assistants, and the reason is the comparative barrenness of thought to be noted in the average text. It is commonly a mere assemblage of pages and paragraphs culled from what earlier texts and excerpts may be at hand, and its value as a stimulus to understanding the historical process is almost nil.

There is, however, another kind of text, the product of a teacher of high reputation who has directed a "survey" of a wide field over a space of many years. He acquires something of a mastery of that subject, and when he puts down his views of the large aspects of that field, of its important qualifications and minor motives, with his special approaches to its particular divisions, then we may expect an unusual contribution. Volumes of this type have been developed by Carlton J. H. Hayes, Herbert E. Bolton, Samuel K. Wilson, Carl Stephenson and some few others whose texts have the merit of original thought, mature wisdom, sober judgment and broad understanding. These works often approach the scholarly monograph, and though they lack the sightly footnotes their doctrine is sound and even basic in historical instruction.

The present volume of Professor Hicks would seem to merit this distinction. The experience and good name of the professor are a professional commonplace. His book has the usual characteristic of growth, organic life, development. He has assimilated his subject and mulled over it and made it his personal thought. The illustrations would in themselves call for notice, in their local color and contemporary flavor as reproductions from the prints of the times under discussion. And the map work is attractive and helpful to the reader. But the internal structure of the book stands out most notably; here is the sign of maturity and strength. History is a story, and this story has no breaks, no interjected scenes, no haltings to pick up the ends of things; it moves onward with the rising life of the new American people.

Ever since Turner wrote, there has been a tendency to put stress on our political history. And the reason is patent, for Turner and his descendants take it as a postulate that the significant institution produced by the Americans is their government, their democracy in organized life. A scattered set of families and small communities faced the limitless geography

of this wide country and literally made it into a unity, and their bond of oneness is in the type of ruling system that they molded.

This volume takes that story through its first half, its federal period, until such time as it would be changed by the great trial of civil strife that closed in 1865. That was the end of an epoch, and out of it would come a new and greater chapter in the life of America. This later chapter has been done by a notable teacher of Professor Hicks, Frederick L. Paxson, and so the former has been content to let his master handle his tools in peace.

A fine selection of book aids is appended to the text. The binding and type work are excellent. This volume is highly recommended.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Loyola University, Chicago

Decet Meminisse Fratrum, A Necrology of Chicago Diocesan Priests, 1844-1937. By Reverend Francis J. Epstein, P. R., A. M. Wheaton, Illinois, 1937. pp. 109.

The story of a great city is inevitably interwoven with the forces that build its social organization and its material development, and in American urban development very much of this story is bound up with Catholic parochial life. The parish priest is a nucleus in this growth. He builds his first church and school. To this new center flock families from all directions. New homes arise, and mercantile establishments. Associations mature and multiply with increasing civic power, educational expansion, political action.

A digest of parochial clergy is vital in the structure of local history. This volume offers such a list, beginning with the forerunners and embodying all the subsequent priests of the regularly erected diocese after 1843. The date of death is given for each, and the parish with which he was associated. A dual list is given, first according to calendar and death, then in alphabetical manner. Excellent footnotes enlarge the human story. The printing is clear, with spaces in the calendar left for future entries of decease. Written to aid pious remembrance and prayer, the book is also commendable for research reference.

W. EUGENE SHIELS

Loyola University, Chicago

Archbishop Lamy, An Epoch Maker. By Louis H. Warner. Santa Fe, New Mexico, Santa Fe New Mexican Publishing Corp., 1936. pp. 315. $3.50.

In this book Judge Louis H. Warner expresses in complete terms his abiding admiration for a great ecclesiastical builder and organizer of the Southwest from 1850 to 1888, the Archbishop whom Willa Cather has immoralized in her novel. Judge Warner spent six years in the composition of his tribute to Lamy and in gathering innumerable items of local interest and color and background to embellish his familiar and chatty product. The sincerity of the author is a charming feature of the book, which should be popular to a degree and which may be read by Catholics and non-Catholics to their edification and instruction. This reviewer has no hesitancy in recommending the work for the above reasons to general readers.

But it must be stated that Judge Warner from the very first lines of

his introduction is in no wise concerned with satisfying profound scholars or historians nor with writing a textbook for historians, that is, a book "of many references, with the usual innumerable cross-notes and citations of authority for the statements which I have made, so frequent and so distracting, as to even annoy the average reader, myself included." With this statement the author proceeds to a general discussion of his sources and materials, explaining the difficulties which he encountered in his work. Understanding his objective, the reader will not mind the absence of an index and bibliography. The printing and format is very satisfactory. The concluding summary statement is that Lamy "stands as the peer of Serra in California, Kino or Garces in Arizona, and any that had gone before in New Mexico. He was truly a Man of God, and his was a mighty epoch."

JEROME V. JACOBSEN

Loyola University, Chicago

The Middle Classes Then and Now. By Franklin Charles Palm. New York, Macmillan, 1936. pp. xiv+421. $3.50.

In this time of crisis when the traditional bourgeois doctrines are subjected to the attacks of moderate reformers and more questionable discontents, a study dealing with that long ignored population group, the middle classes, which has been, and is, the balancing bar of history, should attract interest. Since the development of the interpretation, the influence of the business and professional man upon the course of history has been recognized, and monographs and popular works have treated the history of the middle-class group for restricted periods or regions. The present work attempts a general historical survey of the aims, activity and attitudes of this relative group throughout the entire course of European civilization. Commencing with the commercial men of Egypt and Babylon, the author summarily outlines the rise of the mercantile and financial entities throughout European, as well as American, history and terminates the discussion in the middle of 1936; from Pepi to the New Deal.

Professor Palm has drawn upon his vast historical background to present this synthesis, which he limits to a "chronological and political" account of the middle class, with no pretensions towards detailed or exhaustive treatment. The author has creditably selected his material so that the general reader is neither overwhelmed nor left uninformed. It would only be an expression of personal preference to state that greater emphasis might have been given to the rise of the business group during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, or that the mercantilistic body in England during the later seventeenth and eighteenth cenuries might have been more fully treated. Dr. Palm adequately indicates, since the term is not precisely definable, the general composition of the middle class, and to it with quite general consistency he restricts the discussion. The political narrative is interspersed with chapters and sections dealing with the attitudes of the intellectual and literary leaders: Voltaire and Darwin, Calvin, Adam Smith and Marx, Thackeray and Sinclair Lewis.

This reviewer must take exception to the author's expressed treatment of the attitude of the Roman Catholic Church and particularly the papacy towards economo-liberalism after the middle of the nineteenth century. The general tenor of this section (pp. 275-280) is impartial but the selec-

tion of words and of details tends towards a false impression. Infallibility was not the only accomplishment of the Vatican Council, the sessions of which were prorogued due to the political circumstances at Rome. "Accepted" would be a less offensive word than "were submissive to," in characterizing the attitude of Catholics toward infallibility. Despite Professor Hayes' professional prestige and personal religious belief, a more authoritative writer might have been quoted in reference to the Catholic Church's views upon evolution. Finally Leo XIII's encyclical, *Rerum novarum*, was as much an attack upon bourgeois business principles as a ". . . support of . . . bourgeois emphasis on the sanctity of private property, . . ." (p. 279). The professional historian will find other relatively slight errors, such as the statement that Luther's theses were publicized throughout the Germanies within a fortnight (p. 49). It might also be questioned whether "the middle classes" possessed such a well-planned program and such active continuity of purpose before the French Revolution as the author implicitly emphasizes.

Despite these minor criticisms, this book is a distinct contribution to historical literature and it should not only appeal to, but also demand the attention of, the general reader and the scholar. To the layman it provides a concise and thought-provoking survey of that class in which a majority of this quarterly's readers may be classified. To the professional student it will propose a stimulating hypothesis. Moreover, this book opens up new vistas and indicates many subjects which require "more intensive research and additional publications." Written in popular style yet exhibiting profound scholarship, this work offers two recommendable characteristics too often absent in historical studies, interest and appeal.

EDWARD P. LILLY

Loyola University, Chicago

American Constitutional Law. By Charles W. Gerstenberg. New York, Prentice-Hall, 1937. pp. xiii+772. $5.

Histories and brochures on the Constitution of the United States and on the Supreme Court are very much in demand today, as an increasingly discerning group of readers is seeking its information on these vital topics in scholarly and authoritative works rather than from the pages of best sellers. Professor Gerstenberg's book has the twofold intent of serving as a textbook and of presenting in popular style the intricacies of our Constitutional Law. Prefaced by valuable hints to the student for the use of the text, compact in its contents, it follows a quite different arrangement from that found in the traditional case books on Constitutional Law, such as those by Professor Dodd and Professor Long. It will serve well as an intermediate text, will prove excellent for a semester course, or as a supplementary work for review purposes, although somewhat too brief for a full year's course. As for the layman, he may read the book with considerable profit, but probably with difficulty, because the subject matter is tersely and succinctly set forth, closely reasoned, and of its very nature technical, requiring close attention and allowing little opportunity to relax.

The book lends itself to a logical two-fold division. The first portion contains textual matter in which the historical background of the Constitution is traced, followed by a rather full treatment of constitutional topics,

such as the executive, legislative, and judicial powers, the power to regulate commerce, and taxation, civil rights, police powers, and due process, all heavily supplemented with references to text material, magazine articles, and cases. Many of the cases cited are constitutional landmarks, including recent decisions of the Supreme Court on New Deal measures. The second part of the book is devoted to cases on Constitutional Law classified under chapter headings that are the same as those in the first part and hence so organized as to illustrate and support textual matter by case material. The cases are so deleted as to cover only the legal points discussed in the subject matter. Effort is made to give very briefly some of the dissenting opinions, and in this respect it seems the author has referred a little too much. Since the selection of cases is a matter of taste in many instances, some students will quarrel with the author, especially because some of the leading cases are conspicuous by their absence; nevertheless, this reviewer thinks the selections very good.

The statement (p. 1) that "as a branch of *public law* the formal body of rules known as Constitutional Law is made up of the written document, of legislative interpretation, usage and amplification, of executive interpretation and usage, and to a lesser degree (especially when compared with its position in private law) of judicial interpretation" is probably true when taken in the sense which the author intended, but it is apt to be misleading. There is a wealth of litigated cases in which constitutional principles have been developed, and, in the opinion of the reviewer, this phase of Constitutional Law compares favorably with substantive law of other fields. It may not always be consistent, but it is well reasoned and very well presented, and certainly much easier to get at and much more authoritative than any of the other sources of Constitutional Law.

State Government and Administration in the United States. By Arthur W. Bromage. New York and London, Harper, 1936. pp. ix+678. $3.50.

There is a wealth of general material in book form dealing with our state governments, some of it very good, much of it indifferent, and some of it of negative value. Even for the instructor who has been teaching the subject for many years the task of choosing one of the better texts is well nigh bewildering, what with the plethora of books and the legal, constitutional, economic, and social approaches of the authors. Slightly different from the standard texts of Beard, Munro, Ray and Ogg, and Young, is this very excellent treatment by Professor Bromage, which has the outstanding qualities of teachability as far as the instructor is concerned, readability and interest for the student, and authority and objectivity from the standpoint of the scholar. The author is revealed as an expert in his field, and as a writer and teacher who keeps his readers in mind.

The contents of the book are well arranged and the printing well done. There is an absence of emphasis on any one pet theory, and although Professor Bromage has produced special and fine works on county and local government, he assigns no undue amount of space to these phases, but maintains them in a proper proportion to the rest of the matter. He carries out his objectives very nicely, for in discussing the new trends in state administration he incorporates old as well as new aspects of the current all-important topic of federal-state relations. New administrative trends,

as well as the problems of administration, are given the treatment they deserve in the light of the increasing import of administration in government. Historical background is presented before each of the discussions, and the development of each topic is thus traced in its setting from its beginning to its modern ramifications. Over and above the noteworthy features of format, ample footnote citation, and valuable reading suggestions, there is an appendix containing a copy of the much-discussed *Model State Constitution*, the work of a select committee of the National Municipal League. This has set the standard in its field and has had a wide influence over a period of thirteen years on the thinking with respect to the problems of state government, and the author makes use of it throughout his work. Professor Bromage gives a book that is modern in every respect.

JOHN A. ZVETINA

Loyola University, Chicago

Contributors

Reverend Charles Metzger, S. J., Ph. D., is Assistant Professor of History at West Baden College, Indiana, which is affiliated with Loyola University of Chicago.

Sister Mary Paul Fitzgerald is just completing her doctoral work at St. Louis University.

Reverend Jean Delanglez, S. J., Research Professor at Loyola University and member of the Institute of Jesuit History, will conclude his article on La Salle in the October number of MID-AMERICA.